

THE

# MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

---

MAY, 1852.

---

VOL. IV.—NO. III.

---

## SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE.<sup>1</sup>

Lev. xxvii: 30-32—Ex. xxx: 13-16—1 Cor. xvi: 1-2—  
Act. xx: 35.

### *Conclusion.*

### *III. Systematic Benevolence in America.*

In the United States of North America, Church and State, as is known, are separated from each other, similarly as in the first three centuries, until Constantine the Great; with this important difference, however, that at that time the State, which was most intimately connected with heathen idolatry, did not at all legally acknowledge the Church, and even bloodily persecuted her, whilst with us both powers exist peaceably side by side of each other, and at least indirectly give to each other mutual protection. For on the one hand our religious corporations en-

---

<sup>1</sup> A Sermon preached by appointment before the Synod of the German Reformed Church of the U. S., at Lancaster, Pa., on the 20th of October, 1851, and published by request of the Synod.

joy the protection of the civil law, as it regards person and property, and on the other hand, christianity evidently forms the moral basis and support of our republic, without which it must in a short time be dissolved in complete anarchy. We may lament indeed the religious indifferentism of our State-constitutions, so far as they are the product of the wide-spread infidelity of the last century, and cannot in any way regard the abstract separation as the normal and ultimate condition, which requires rather a harmonious union of religion and morality and the absolute, though free dominion of the christian principle over all the faculties and relations of the individual and national life, or in one word a theocracy, where God shall be all in all, and where Christ shall rule king amongst the nations as He ruleth now king in the church. Still we infinitely prefer the separation and independent position of the secular and spiritual powers, to an absolute hierarchy on the one side, and to the Erastian principle on the other, and that intermeddling of the State with the internal concerns of the church, which we find in most of the Protestant establishments or State-churches of Europe, to the injury of religion and piety; and we have every reason to be thankful to God, that the church here enjoys perfect freedom, and can discharge independently and without interruption all her own peculiar functions. For it is not seemly, that the free-born daughter of heaven, the royal Bride of the God-man and the World-Saviour, should be degraded to the maid-servant of earthly power and its temporal interests. The less the church is restricted in the possession and exercise of her innate rights, the more beneficially will she also operate upon civil society; the more she is honored as the servant of Christ, as an immediately divine institution for the salvation of the world, so much the more will she prove herself in the noblest sense, the servant of the people, as Christ Himself, the Lord of heaven, served us in His own free love and offered Himself up for us even unto death.

A natural result of this relation of peaceful neutrality between religion and politics, between Church and State in our country, and that unlimited freedom of conscience necessarily connected with it, is what is called the *voluntary* system in the support of religion. Here the church must everywhere alone take care of all her concerns, and provide for herself the necessary pecuniary means for the exercise of her duties and the attainment of her benevolent objects. She has indeed by all means the right to require from her members certain contributions for her support, and is in solemn duty bound, to present them earnestly to their

hearts and consciences, as an essential exercise of piety. But she can compel no person externally by co-ercive measures to these contributions, as the State may in collecting its taxes; on the contrary she is permitted to employ only spiritual motives, that may be applied to the conscience and the free will. For she is not a legal institution, that has its ground in a physical necessity and its end in the temporal welfare of society, as the civil commonwealth, but a moral religious community, founded upon the gospel for the spread of the glory of God, and the eternal happiness of man. She could indeed here call to her assistance the laws of the State in enforcing the payment of formal obligations and subscriptions, that have been once given her; but in doing so she would violate her own nature, sacrifice her dignity, and lose her influence among the people. The only penalties, which are at the command of the church as such, are of a moral character, namely, first private, then public admonition, and in extreme cases, exclusion from the enjoyment of the means of grace, until repentance takes place. Corporeal punishments, however, and the deprivation of civil rights proceed only from the political authority, and therefore cannot be admitted for the violation of religious duties, where the State and Church are separated from each other, except in the few cases, where the former has a common interest with the latter, as is for instance the case with us in the observation of the sabbath and monogamy.

Now this state of things has the disadvantage, that the maintenance of the church and her officers is rendered more burdensome, and the contributions of those, to a great extent, taken away, who do not stand with her in any internal connection, although they enjoy the outward blessings of christian civilization and are therefore under obligations to her. But on the other hand, the voluntary system is nevertheless in perfect harmony with the evangelical nature of the church and calls forth an amount of individual christian benevolence and sacrifice, which then again exerts a salutary influence upon other departments of the religious life. A most brilliant proof of this was furnished lately to the world by the "*Free Church of Scotland*," which, since its secession from the established church (1843,) has been thrown upon the voluntary system, and raised, in the last eight years with its eight hundred congregations, over twelve millions of dollars for ecclesiastical objects. Her contributions for missions have more than doubled those of the much more wealthy church of the State. With us too indeed the good effects of this system outweigh the many and sometimes highly

vexatious grievances, which are certainly brought upon the church by the management of her own pecuniary concerns. We should not therefore permit ourselves to be discouraged by the difficulties growing out of this condition, nor lust after the flesh-pots of a wealthy State-church, governed and paid with military precision; rather we should labor with all the moral and religious means at our command, to awaken in our congregations the proper spirit of christian love and liberality. When this *spirit* is once there, then will also gifts come in of themselves regularly and to the desired amount. But we dare never lose sight of our peculiar relations, nor go any further in our ecclesiastical legislation, than the conviction and good will of our congregations admit. In the present condition of our German people, particularly of the foreign Germans, who were accustomed in Europe to see the governments provide for all the necessities of the church, the first steps in this matter must be gentle and cautious, otherwise the nonsensical cry of priest-craft and tyranny of conscience will at once be raised. To make laws, which cannot be carried out, is very unwise, and can only serve, to undermine the respect for law and authority itself.

From this point of view, we desire the following suggestions to be considered. They are indeed mere suggestions, which we do not wish to be followed any further than present circumstances seem to make it advisable, and which may be subjected to considerable modifications by a more enlightened and experienced judgment.

We now enter upon the particular objects, for whose support a well-established religious community should feel concerned. We may divide them into three classes: 1. *Congregational worship*. 2. *The general institutions and operations of the church*. 3. *The poor*.

#### a. *The Maintenance of Congregational Worship.*

The maintenance of congregational worship includes the support of the pastor, the erection, preservation and repair of the church-building, the providing of sacred furniture, the care of the education of the young, in short, everything that pertains to the prosperity of the single local congregation. Here beneficence can be most demanded, and here it will be also exercised much more generally and to a greater extent, than for other purposes, as this object lies nearest to the individual and recommends itself at once to his attention.



1. The *salary of the minister* should be neither too high, nor too low, but just so large, as is necessary to secure for him a decent subsistence, one that will correspond with his station, as well as the social character of his people, and enable him at the same time, to set a good example of charity to the poor and to incite his flock to imitation. Wealth, as a rule, of which, however, there are always and everywhere honorable exceptions, is more injurious, than advantageous to the clerical rank, produces easily worldliness and cripples energy of action; if in addition covetousness and avarice are associated with it, they ruin the moral influence of the minister almost entirely and bring him into contempt. The opposite extreme of real poverty involves him, who should devote his time and strength entirely to the service of the word and the altar, in secular care, cuts him off from the means of the further improvement of his mind, to his own injury as well as to that of the congregation, and discourages him in the fulfilment of his duty. Here the maxim in the full sense is valid: "*Mittelmaas ist die beste Strass*," a medium is best. If in this respect we compare our congregations with some other churches, we may well recommend to them a greater degree of liberality. The ministers, in the Lutheran as well as in the Reformed Church, receive on an average a much smaller salary, than the clergy of the leading English denominations in congregations of similar means, and yet they have officially perhaps twice as much to attend to, owing to the wide extent of their charges and the frequent necessity of officiating in two languages. Would that our laity might reflect, that it is before God and the world their shame, that they often permit their spiritual shepherds to suffer for want. In the minister, the congregation honors itself, and in him it despises itself.

2. As it regards the erection and improvement of *buildings* for the exclusive use of divine services, they are indeed not absolutely necessary, as times of persecution and most missionary stations prove, for we can everywhere worship the omnipresent God in spirit and in truth. Nevertheless they are very important for the orderly continuance of a congregation, and they will therefore be erected, where circumstances admit, as in the case of the synagogues and the temple among the Jews, and according also to the general custom of the christian Church. In our land great activity has been manifested in reference to the erection of houses of worship, and for several years past a more refined taste for church-architecture has been almost generally awakened, even in those denominations, that originally proceeded from the principle of the greatest simplicity in divine service, and rejected steeples,

bells and organs entirely. Not only Roman Catholics and Episcopalians, but also Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists and Methodists have begun to erect splendid and costly churches, though not seldom in singular misconception of style, or in striking contradiction between the outside and their internal arrangement. Many of our Protestant churches resemble theatres, or heathen temples of idolatry much more, than christian houses of God, whilst others are externally Gothic, i. e., medieval and catholic, but internally modern and puritanic; and have, instead of an altar, which in earlier times was looked upon as the indispensable sanctissimum, a pompous, theatrical stage for the spiritual "orator," who then makes an unnecessary and unbecoming parade and entirely absorbs the liturgus and the priest. As a general thing in our modern church-structures there is perhaps too much regard paid to fashion, secular ornament and personal comfort, while the idea of solemnity, and what tends to elevate the soul and to fill it with religious impressions, is overlooked. Many churches in our cities are almost like a fashionable parlour, which would probably rouse the indignation of Farel and John Knox, as much as once did the altars and images of Popery. The church is the house of worship, and to be a real work of art, it should indeed by its whole appearance and structure raise us from earth to heaven, and awaken in us the feeling: "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground; this is the house of God; here is the gate of heaven."

But irrespective of such mongrel forms, in which the contradiction between modern fashion, and the traditional theology, the disharmony of the style of architecture with the idea of divine service, comes to light, in general we cannot but approve of the awakened predilection for beautiful churches, and we rejoice in every advance, which is made among us in this respect. If we build fine houses for ourselves, why not much more so for God? The best belongs to the Lord. Many indeed think, that money would be much better applied, if it were given to the poor, instead of erecting with it a dead heap of stones. So also thought Judas, the traitor, when Mary anointed the Saviour's feet with costly oil of spikenard, and concealed under this hypocritical sympathy for the poor only his own filthy avarice! The one should be done, and the other not left undone. A majestic house of worship is as it were a visible sermon, which points every attentive looker-on from earth to heaven, from the temporal to the eternal, and speaks to him in silent eloquence of the prayers and the acts of self-sacrificing love and

piety, which has heaped up stone upon stone to the honor of the Lord, and to the advancement of the devotion of His assembled people. A single Gothic dome with its spires, like so many hands pointing towards the heavenly Jerusalem, with the mysterious light and shade of its stained glass, with its majestic arches, its solemn silence, its stirring chime of bells, has from year to year, from generation to generation, from century to century, like the temple once at Jerusalem, banished innumerable worldly thoughts, animated to works of charity, and brought sinners to hesitate, and reflect upon the condition of their souls.

3. Finally to the complete prosperity of a christian congregation, belongs also a *school*; and here a new field is opened for our benevolence, upon which we can only cursorily touch. It was a beautiful custom of our fore-fathers, that they erected beside the church also a school-house, and next to the preacher of the gospel they looked about for a teacher. The church and the school are most closely connected together. The church is the mother of all popular education, and the school ought to be the nursery of the church, so that we can say: *from the house into the school, from the school into the church, from the church into heaven*. It is only when both go together hand in hand, that either can fully meet its object.

At the present time, it is true, the civilization of Europe and America, which is entirely the fruit of Christianity, has to a very considerable extent ungratefully separated itself from its maternal soil, the church, and among us a system of public schools has been erected, that stands exclusively under the supervision of the state and is, like the state itself, indifferent to religion or at least to all positive creeds. We would not deny that this arrangement may serve to awaken the slumbering faculties of the mind of our nation, and in this respect effect much good. But here if the church does not in some supplementary way interfere, we are fearful that our public schools may educate an unbelieving generation, and that the blessing of culture may be converted into a curse. For that culture only is a blessing to a people, which rests upon a sound moral and religious basis, and keeps in view the eternal interests of the immortal spirit. "Education," says a late writer on this subject in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct., 1851, p. 763, "education unbaptized and unimpregnated with the christian spirit, is not only partial and defective, it is often positively pernicious. It is a curse instead of a blessing. It is an actual training for crime, a laborious providing of dangers for the community, a conferring of power, with the positive certainty of its abuse. It disciplines the evil passions of our

nature, makes men wicked by rule, reduces vice to a system, and subjects the clear head and the strong arm to the impulse of the bad heart. The mildew of a cultivated but depraved mind, blights whatever it falls upon. It sears the souls of men. No human imagination can set bounds to the evil, either in space or duration. Through the agency of the press, it reaches other times and far distant ages." It is true we have Sunday Schools, which seek to compensate for the want of religious instruction in our elementary schools, and they truly deserve in a high degree the sympathy and active assistance of every christian and philanthropist. Yet it may with reason be doubted, whether they entirely meet the wants of the case, and whether they are capable of preventing permanently the injury referred to above. It appears to us, that the establishment of a regular system of *parochial* schools, alone can meet the pressing want, and they therefore should claim the attention of all the friends of a genuine intellectual, and at the same time moral and religious education of the people. It is high time for our classes and synods to think about it, before the waves of the unbelieving spirit of the age break over our heads, and scorn the voice of the church. Single efforts of the kind have been made already in several congregations, and have given full proofs of their importance and usefulness. Moreover if the church would sustain good schools, she must also be concerned about good school *teachers*, and also a good institution, where they may be regularly prepared for their important calling. Our public schools are to some extent precisely on this account in such a truly miserable condition, because most of the states have not at all thought of founding normal schools, and seminaries for school-teachers, and consequently have entrusted their youth to such, as have often need themselves first to learn the elements. The church could bring into existence such an institution for the education of school-teachers most easily, and with the least expense, in connection with the already existing colleges.

Still the church dare not stop here. She is not to rest satisfied with the elementary education, which should be made accessible to all persons without exception, but to urge forward also those who have talent and inclination for wider cultivation, to the higher and highest grades of mental improvement. She is, according to the testimony of history, the mother not only of popular schools, but also of colleges and universities. It therefore pertains to a complete system of education, that every ecclesiastical district, whether it be called *Classis* or *Synod*, should establish and sustain a classical Preparatory school, or as we say

in this country, an Academy; and every denomination according to its extent and wants, one or more Gymnasias or Colleges; and where circumstances permit and make it advisable even a University with all the four faculties, where the most gifted youth may be educated for the various professions. This, however, already leads us beyond the horizon of congregational wants, and it can therefore be but cursorily referred to. We will only add, that if the church wishes to do her whole duty, advance with the times in the best sense of the term, and exert a salutary influence upon the nation in every direction, she must with all her energy lay hold of the great subject of education, the cultivation of the mind and the heart, in all its grades and forms, and consecrate and sanctify it with the spirit of the gospel. Knowledge is power, and without it no denomination can expect to prosper permanently. It is among the most encouraging and hopeful facts in the history of the German Reformed and Lutheran churches in America, that zeal for education after a long slumber has in more recent times made powerful strides among them, as their academies, colleges and seminaries alone are sufficient to show, which, have sprung into existence, within the last twenty or thirty years.

4. But now the question arises, how shall the necessary means for the different branches of congregational religion be procured. Here we recommend according to the pattern of the Old Testament and of the ancient church, the giving of the *tenth*, as a *free-will offering*, which from an inward impulse and with a joyful heart, may be presented to our Lord and Saviour. This arrangement originates from the all-wise God himself, and therefore needs not human recommendation and justification. It moreover commends itself also to rational reflection. It does not require from the wealthy too little, nor from the poor too much, but from each precisely in proportion to his ability, and exacts from him, who is entirely without income, no contribution at all. It would indeed be difficult to, hit upon a better arrangement, than this, which proceeded from God Himself, and which has been approved and practised more or less by the christian church at all times.

But now the circumstances referred to above, in which we are placed, do not by any means permit us to make the tithe, a legal duty, and to impose it upon our congregations as a tax under threat of church discipline. This especially among our Germans would be impracticable and have the most injurious results. In this respect we dare not go further than the church in the first centuries, which indeed looked upon the tithe as binding

upon christians also, but left the actual payment of the same to the free-will of individuals. For formal laws of the church respecting it, as said above, are not found before the sixth century, and state-laws not before the eighth. All that we can do in the matter under present circumstances, is to recommend it as a gift well pleasing in the sight of God. We must make ourselves and our people familiar with the thought, that at least the tenth part of our income belongs to the Lord, from whom the blessing upon our labors proceeds, and should be expended in the promotion of His kingdom upon earth, and that we, instead of yielding to the Jews in piety and benevolence, should rather surpass them, in the same degree, in which the glory of the new covenant outshines that of the old. This obligation we may recommend even to those who are not communicant members of the church. For if they do not immediately enjoy the spiritual blessings of the same, to their own great injury, they nevertheless derive all kinds of inestimable temporal advantages from her, and the permanence and prosperity of the church is of even still greater importance for the security of their person and property, for the interest of their children and children's children, than the permanence and welfare of the State, which without the direct or the indirect influence of religion and morality, could not prosper, sustain the authority of its laws, nor least of all enjoy the blessings of freedom. As thou renderest unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, so from these lower considerations, if not from higher religious motives, thou shouldst render unto God the things that are God's.

O, if we christians, we children of God, and heirs of eternal life, properly appreciated the innumerable favors and blessings which we daily and hourly enjoy at the hands of our heavenly father, if true thankfulness and reciprocal love for His infinite love, inflamed our hearts, we would cheerfully give Him and His church, not only the tenth, but as much of our income as we could in any way spare; yea, those examples of former times, which at present alas! have almost entirely become extinct, would then return in abundance, when wealthy youth and men, virgins and widows, in literal fulfilment of the Saviour's word, Matth. xix : 21, sold all their goods, devoted them to benevolent objects, and taking upon themselves their cross, followed the Lord in voluntary poverty, who when He was upon earth had no where to lay His head, and became poor that He might make us rich.

That the contribution of the tenth, if it were practised only by the greater part of christians, would suffice for all the wants

of congregational services, and the education of the young, does not well admit of a doubt in the wealthy condition of our land. Indeed there would be an important surplus remaining, which then according to the best individual judgment might be allotted to other benevolent objects, or handed over into the general treasury of the church, to be expended especially for the support of needy missionary stations. In the Free Church of Scotland, according to the proposition of the late Dr. Chalmers, the congregational contributions flow together into a general treasury of the church for the support of the ministers, from which then an equal part (150 £) is paid to each of them, in addition to what they may directly receive from their parishioners in the way of presents in proportion to their means and liberality. This plan, however, at least so far as it regards the contemplated amount of 150 £ or about \$660, has not been fully realized yet, and Dr. Chalmers shortly before his death had given up the principle of the *equal* distribution of the minister's fund, and recommended to the church a change in this respect, which will probably be made by the Assembly at some future time. In our relations, this system, however much may be said in its favor, could not be introduced, except in the case of our missionary stations, and we must therefore leave to each congregation the independent management of its own pecuniary matters.

5. In addition to the tenth, the Jews, as we have seen above, were accustomed to give to the priests a part of the *first fruits*. This model gave rise, already in the early times of the church, to the custom of presenting the minister occasionally, besides his fixed support, with free will offerings of money or produce. We consider this practice as praiseworthy in itself, and as well calculated to encourage the pastor, and to fasten more firmly the tie between him and his flock. The surplice fees, however, (*jura stolae* or *stola*, in opposition to the *jura altaris*) or regular perquisites, i. e. the obligatory pay for official acts such as baptisms, confirmations, funerals, as also the so-called confessor's fee, were unknown to christian antiquity, or directly forbidden as a species of simony (Acts viii: 18,) and came into vogue at a later period in the Greek and Roman churches, and were transplanted from these into most Protestant churches. They certainly present the danger of giving to sacred functions, a trade-like and mercenary appearance, and thereby are apt to degrade the clerical office in the eyes of the people. We cannot therefore in any way regret the abrogation of this custom in the most of our English congregations, but must at the same time maintain, that



in our European German congregations a sudden change in this respect would be imprudent, and therefore not advisable.

*b. The support of the general Institutions and Operations of the Church.*

The second subject of christian benevolence, are *the general institutions and operations of the church*. Among these we regard the *Theological Seminary*, the *Education* of gifted and pious young men for the holy ministry, *Domestic and Foreign Missions*.

We are not only members of a single congregation but of a confession or denomination, and through these at the same time members of the whole christian church, and we should therefore take the most lively and active part in their benevolent establishments and operations. He who interests himself merely for his own local congregation, has no conception at all of the christian *church*, of that communion of saints, which embraces every land and time, yea, heaven and earth; and also ignores entirely the welfare of his own particular congregation. For as the single member in the body can increase and prosper only, when the whole body is healthy, so it holds in our case. The weal and the wo, the honor and the shame, the bloom and the decline of a denomination, and of single congregations, go hand in hand. Usually, therefore, they who take no interest in the general matters and institutions of the church, are also the most negligent members of the congregation, and the reverse. Individual or personal piety must necessarily enlarge itself into congregational; congregational into denominational, or confessional; denominational, that it may not degenerate into sectarianism or party spirit, into churchly, or in a good sense, catholic piety, so as to sympathize with the entire body of Christ in all countries and times.

The object of the church of Christ in general, as also of her particular branches, or confessions, is the same as that of the incarnation of the Son of God, namely, the redemption of the world from sin and misery, the regeneration, the conversion, the sanctification, and the perfection of the whole human race, until God shall be all in all. This exalted end can be reached only through the divinely appointed means of grace, i. e. especially the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments. This again cannot be done without living organs, to whom the office of the word and altar as a duty belongs. "How



shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard? How shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent?" (Rom. x: 14, 15.) As now further every calling, but especially so difficult and responsible an office, as that of the ministry of reconciliation, requires diligent preparation, and as further in all times, a great, if not the greatest part of the clergy, have proceeded from the lower and poorer ranks of society; it follows that the church, to reach that object, must have a care for the education of pious and promising young men for the ministerial office, that they may on the one hand preserve Christianity in congregations already established, and on the other hand carry the word of God into the domestic and foreign missionary fields to the most distant heathen. A well-grounded education for the ministerial office, requires however further a regular Theological School; and this again presupposes other schools, where elementary knowledge, the arts and sciences generally, without which theology is destitute of the necessary ground-work, shall be taught. From this appears the close, inseparable connection, in which the four above mentioned general operations of the church stand. *Foreign* missions can never flourish, without *Domestic* missions and a living zeal in the midst of Christendom itself. But whence shall the missionaries come, the ministers and shepherds for abroad and at home, if the church has no concern for their *Education*; and how shall these ministers instruct others in the word of God, if they have never enjoyed proper instruction in it themselves! And where can this necessary knowledge be obtained more readily, safely, and thoroughly, than in a *Theological Seminary*? We may therefore regard all these four branches of benevolence, as essentially one and the same interest, and also embrace their support from the same point of view.

The question now arises, what is the best method for this support, that the church may grow internally, supply itself constantly with an able after-growth of ministers, and at the same time extend ever wider and wider the boundaries of the kingdom of Jesus Christ with its innumerable blessings. For this the support of the Israelitish temple may serve us as a model. As already remarked, according to divine appointment, every Jew from twenty years and upwards, without distinction of rank and property, was obliged to contribute yearly a half shekel, or two drachms, i. e. in our currency about thirty cents, for the maintenance of the general national sanctuary, which was at first the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple at Jerusalem. "The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less

than half a shekel, when they give an offering unto the Lord to make an atonement for your souls" (Exodus xxx : 13-16 ; 2 Chron. xxiv : 6). The Saviour himself with his disciples was accustomed to pay this tribute, although He, as the Son of God, and Lord of the temple, was free from this obligation (Matth. xvii : 26-27).

If now the Jews under the imperfect revelation of the Old Testament, and at a time, when the value of money was much higher than at present, contributed, in addition to the tithe, the first fruits, and the free will gifts to the poor, also yearly thirty cents for the maintenance of the common centre of divine worship: should not we, under the more perfect revelation of the New Testament, in the enjoyment of the innumerable benefits of the gospel, in a rich, free and happy land, be cheerfully prepared to contribute, the relatively smaller amount of at least fifty cents yearly for all the general objects of the church, to which we belong? At present the burden of supporting our Seminary, our Educational and Missionary interests, falls upon a small part of our members, while hundreds and thousands give themselves no concern about them at all. By the introduction, however, and the carrying out of a general rule, this inequality would be adjusted, from no one would too much be required, and yet on the whole much more would come in than at present. The number of communicant members in the Reformed church is estimated at 80,000 at least. If every one would throw into the general treasury of the church at least half a dollar a year, we should obtain \$40,000, with which we might in a short time firmly endow our Literary Institutions, double and treble our missionary operations, and at the same time educate for the gospel ministry a much greater number of pious young men, than is alas! at present the case. In the Lutheran church, which, numerically considered, according to the statistical reports, is at least twice as strong, the income of course would be twice as much. We would, however, to be safe, at first propose only twenty five cents as an average contribution from each member, leaving it of course free to each, to give more if he is able and willing. Even in this case, much more would come into the general treasury of the church, than as yet has been the case either among Lutherans, or Reformed, or the German Evangelical associations, and our general objects of benevolence, could without any difficulty be sustained.

The most convenient time to pay over these contributions to the minister, or the consistory would be on the Sundays, upon which the Holy Communion is administered, which in our cou-

gregations usually takes place four times a year. In order, however, to make this system definite, and to give it the necessary regularity and promptitude, it would be necessary, to appoint a *General Treasurer* of the church, whose business it would be to see, that the contributions be punctually paid over to him by the ministers, and that then the monies thus coming in be devoted to the four branches of the general activity of the church, according to the necessities of each, under the supervision of the Synod, or a Synodical committee with proper security.

Should this proposal of a *yearly contribution of not less than twenty five cents for every communicating member*, not meet with approbation, we then know of no better plan to propose, than to appoint *yearly collections* for each of the four above mentioned objects of benevolence, without specifying any definite amount; a plan which has already often been recommended by Synod, and also partially carried out, but never so regularly and universally, as we could wish. For these collections communion seasons and especially the days of the harvest-sermon would suit best.

### c. *The Support of the Poor.*

The third object of christian benevolence is the care of the *poor* and the *distressed*. "The poor ye have always with you," says the Saviour. God permits the difference of property in human society to continue, partly in order to exercise the poor in humility, in contentment, in thankfulness, in freedom from envy, and to raise their minds from earth to heaven and to the imperishable treasures of the kingdom of God, which are always accessible to them; partly to give the rich a constant opportunity for the exercise of love and benevolence. The Holy Scriptures are full of injunctions to this virtue, and annex to it the most precious promises. "He that hath pity upon the poor, lendeth unto the Lord, and that which he hath given, will he repay him again," says already the Old Testament; and the Saviour promises to reward richly in the great day of account even a drink of water, given to the thirsty. Hence the church at all times has interested herself with peculiar affection and concern in the poor, the sick and the destitute of every description. The proofs thereof are the numberless asylums for the poor, for widows and orphans, for the sick and for strangers, and similar benevolent institutions, by which christian lands and

nations have distinguished themselves so favorably above the territories of heathenism.

In this department of benevolence, a rival of the church has grown up in the numerous *secret societies*, which of late have increased powerfully, and not without the fault of the church itself, which has partly neglected her duty and obligation, or only half discharged it. We do not mean in this to condemn these associations in and of themselves, as little as the public schools. In their own way they may be very commendable and useful, and may contribute to the promotion of certain virtues, provided they do not pass beyond their sphere and put themselves in the place of the church and positive Christianity, as it seems to be the tendency at least of some of them to do. In the last case, their blessing would as certainly be turned into a curse, as the public schools must operate perniciously, so soon as they rise up in a hostile attitude towards religion, and promote infidelity. But irrespective of these possible dangers and consequences, we must in the first place deny, that *secret societies* are of a *benevolent* character, in the strict sense of the term, although they are usually represented as such. They are much more at bottom mutual insurance-companies, whose members in case of sickness receive pay for services rendered, namely the interest for their weekly or monthly contributions, and are of course held together by the principle of self-preservation and self-interest. Beyond the circle of contributing members and their families, the charity of these associations does not at all extend, and therefore they can never take the place of the church. For the gifts of christian love and charity are free and unmerited, and are extended for the most part directly to those, who are excluded from the benefit of those societies, for the reason of their inability to fulfil the necessary pecuniary conditions. Nay, where the mitigation of plain bodily necessity is concerned, love does not stop first to ascertain the amount of moral desert, although the mode and manner of its relief are indeed governed by a wise regard to the character of the subject. It resembles the good Samaritan, who forgetting his national hatred, had compassion on the Jew that had fallen among murderers, and took care of him with the utmost devotion, whilst the Priest and the Levite passed by him with cold indifference. It imitates its author, God Himself, who maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust.—But then it is not satisfied with the removal of mere bodily want: this is to be rather only the bridge to a higher moral and religious labor of love. For Providence sends poverty and sickness, to turn

our attention to our internal miseries, to the much greater want of our souls, and to lead us to true spiritual riches, to the possession of the treasures, which neither moth nor rust can corrupt. This pedagogic end of evil, however, no society can reach, but the Christian Church, which God Himself has established, and to which alone, He has promised everlasting duration.

Hence it is the sacred duty of every individual congregation, which professes the Lord Jesus Christ, the great physician of body and soul, to take care of the poor and destitute, especially in their own midst, with self-denying and self-sacrificing love. It were a horrible disgrace, if the church should be willing to leave this work to the state, or to philanthropic societies, which cannot carry it out in the right way, nor with proper success.

In what way now shall this duty be exercised by each congregation in a systematic manner? We have upon this the fruitful suggestion of the apostle Paul, who made the regulation in the churches of Asia Minor and Greece, that every member on the first day of the week, i. e., on Sunday should, according to the measure of his income, lay by him in store, a contribution for the poor in Palestine, that there might be no gatherings when he came, (1 Cor. xvi : 1-2). From this we see : 1. That the contributions for the poor should take place regularly *every week*, especially on every *Sunday*, when we forget earthly cares and are reminded by the preaching of the gospel of the numberless blessings of God, and stimulated to every good work. 2. That the duty of giving is *general*, and therefore extends not only to the wealthy, but also to all who have any thing to spare, however little it may be. The Macedonian Christians were precisely on this account praised by the apostle Paul, because they themselves notwithstanding their great poverty, contributed above their ability to that fair work of love, (2 Cor. viii : 1ff). It is the duty of every believer to pray, and so also to exercise love and to do good according to his ability. 3. That the amount of benevolent contributions is to be determined by the *ability*. Every one should give conscientiously, in proportion to his profit and to the temporal blessing bestowed upon him by God, remembering, that he must at one time before the everlasting judgment seat render an account, as for every word, that he has spoken, (Matth. xii : 34) so also for every cent which he receives. He who cannot give more, let him extend at least his mite, like the poor widow, who will be praised on that account, as long as the gospel resounds. "If thou hast abundance, give alms accordingly ; if thou hast but a little, be not afraid to give according to that little," Tobit iv : 9. To whom much has

been given, of him also will much be required, and to whom little has been given, of him little will be required.

In most of our congregations, especially in the European German, it is a beautiful ancient custom, on every Sunday after divine worship to take up a cent collection. This was originally designed for the poor, and doubtless took its rise out of that apostolic ordinance; in many cases, however, it has been alienated from this object, and applied to the paying of the minister, and the necessary expenses of divine worship. Let us provide for these wants in some other way, return to that old christian custom, and with earnestness and zeal discharge our sacred obligations to the poor.

The proper managers of the alms of every congregation are the *Deacons* under the supervision of the minister and the elders. According to their original appointment, they were the overseers of the sick and the poor, as we learn from the sixth chapter of the Acts and from the subsequent history of the church. Our deacons for the most part alas! have become estranged from this duty, and there is hardly a shadow thereof remaining. This is a foul stain upon our church-organization, that should claim our most earnest consideration. We have no good reason to pride ourselves upon the apostolic character of our government, so long as our Deacons confine themselves to the business of carrying around on the Sabbath the purse, and of collecting the salary of the minister. For that purpose, the apostles would hardly have instituted a particular office in the church with a solemn ordination and installation.

Corresponding to the office of Deacons in the apostolic church, and onwards until in the thirteenth century, was the office of *Deaconesses* for poor and sick females of the congregation. Thus Paul mentions the deaconess Phoebe in Cenchrea with praise, (Rom. xvi: 1). Females have received particular gifts from the Lord, which should be organized and employed for the benefit of the church. It would therefore be of importance to revive that office; and to maintain thus an evangelical counter-part to the Roman Catholic institution of *Sisters of Charity*, founded A. D., 1634 by Vincent of Paul, which has already dried up innumerable tears, healing the wounds and soothing the pains of both body and soul. Yea, why should not every ecclesiastical district have an Asylum for the poor, the sick, orphans, and widows, where together with bodily help the comfort of eternal life might be imparted to the suffering. The restoration of the office of Deacons to its original significance, the revival of the similar office of *Deaconesses* and of the whole

ecclesiastical care of the sick and the poor, would render secret societies unnecessary, or at all events entirely harmless to the church, and remove the reproach, that she neglected works of charity, which Christ and His apostles impressed so urgently upon her, and which she in past times so abundantly practised. As truly as we are justified according to Paul by faith in the Saviour, so firmly on the other hand stands the word of James: "Faith without works is dead."

If now we comprise in a few words the result of this discussion, we would recommend: 1. In general sustained by the example of the Old Testament and of the first centuries of the christian church, the consecration of the one tenth part of our income—yet not as a legal requirement, but as a free-will offering—for religious and benevolent objects primarily in our own neighborhood, and then for the kingdom of God at large; 2. A special yearly contribution of not less than twenty-five cents for the general institutions and operations of our denomination, according to the Old Testament model of supporting the national sanctuary, Ex. xxx: 13-16; 3. A collection on every Sabbath for the benefit of the poor and the destitute, according to the apostolic direction, 1 Cor. xvi: 1-2, in connection with the revivification of the office of Deacons and Deaconesses. As it regards the application and distribution of the tenth to the different objects of divine worship, and the general activity of the church, as also with regard to the amount of contribution to the poor, every one must take counsel with his conscience, and act according to his means and his best judgment, remembering the account which he owes to God for all His gifts and benefits, and their faithful use.

---

In conclusion, we add a few *practical* remarks which every reader may carry out further for himself.

1. It is high time, for the German Churches in America to free themselves of the charge of penuriousness and covetousness, which hitherto has been attributed to them, and to emulate with all their strength the leading English denominations in the virtue of benevolence and liberality in the spread of the kingdom of God at home and abroad. Of course there are many, who are very liberal and yet strangers to the life of God and full of Pharisaic hypocrisy; but it is impossible that true piety should exist together with hard-heartedness and covetousness, which in the Holy Scripture is called a root of all evil. Economy is a virtue, for which the Germans especially are distinguished, but



covetousness is a vice, one of the most hateful forms of selfishness, by which man becomes at last as cold and heartless, as the stone and metal, on which he has set his affections. The example of the Moravian Society, which is almost entirely German, and has accomplished more comparatively for heathen missions than any other denomination, as also of the liberality of single individuals in almost all the German Churches, prove satisfactorily, of what devotion and self-sacrifice in this department the German is capable, when he is once properly inflamed with the fire of divine love, and awakened to a consciousness of his sacred duty. Then he also is known to give out of a full heart and out of pure love to God and man, and only such a giver is acceptable to the Lord.

2. Let us reflect, that liberality for the holy cause of truth, virtue and godliness has never as yet brought any person to beggary, but according to the express promise of the infallible God, will even in time be blessed. When the Jews, under the old covenant, conscientiously paid their tithes and other contributions, they were prosperous, and had abundance; when they withheld from the Lord the gifts that belonged to Him, they only robbed themselves, and had to repent of it bitterly. At the present day, precisely the most liberal nations, as the English and the Scotch, are the most blessed with earthly prosperity, and it would be a very superficial view, if we should derive this last from their flourishing trade and commerce only, without any reference to the state of religion and morality among them. For why are other lands, which are much more favored by nature, and which once acted a more prominent part in the history of the world, but now morally ruined, also in an external aspect so distracted and full of poverty and misery?

3. Much greater, however, is the inward reward of benevolence, the serenity of conscience, the divine pleasure resulting from the consciousness of having done good. Active, self-devoting, self-sacrificing love is indeed one of the richest and purest sources of true happiness, and he, who closes his ear to the cries of the poor and the frequent claims of benevolence, robs himself in so doing of the noblest enjoyments, of which we can partake in this world. True indeed this joy is not seldom imbibed by the ingratitude and the unworthiness of the subjects, to whom we do good; but this should as little dishearten us, as the sower is discouraged, because some seeds of grain fall inevitably upon the hard way-side, others upon rocky ground, and others still are choked by the thorns and thistles. The greater part of seed, when it is carefully sown, falls nevertheless upon



good ground, and brings forth abundantly, some thirty-fold, some sixty-fold, and some an hundred-fold.

4. If we ministers of the gospel expect greater zeal from our congregations in exercising the virtue of benevolence, then let us consider, that we shall reach this object best, if we set before them the light of a good example. We are by no means excepted from the duty of exercising the duty of love, compassion and benevolence, rather in this precisely lies our strength. It is true, our first and principal duty is to devote our mental powers, and all our time to the Lord; but this does by no means exclude the less important bodily gifts. Let us take an example from among apostolic men of modern and ancient times. *John Wesley* made it a rule to be satisfied with 28*£.*, and to devote what was over to benevolent objects; in the first year he devoted 2*£.*, in the succeeding year 32*£.*, in the fourth 92*£.*, to the support of the poor, and so on; so that he gave much more away than he used for himself. Think of *Augustus Hermann Franke*, who notwithstanding his small means, accomplished incredible things, won for himself one of the first positions among the noblest philanthropists, and in his Orphan-House, at Halle, erected an imperishable monument of love to mankind, of faith in God, of devotion and perseverance. We will also not disdain to learn from that brilliant example of Roman Catholic piety, *Charles Borromeo*, the founder of Sabbath Schools so greatly blessed, whose charitableness almost surpasses description, who as Arch-Bishop of Milan, gave yearly the third part of his income to the poor, applied another third to the building and repairing of churches, and besides founded ten colleges, five hospitals, and a multitude of other benevolent institutions; whilst as for himself he lived in apostolic simplicity and humility, denied himself all comforts, at last even his own bed, and found his greatest pleasure in visiting the huts of misery, of poverty and sickness, and in giving counsel, comfort and aid to the needy and suffering. How we must blush, when we compare ourselves with the apostle *Paul*, who during the day preached the gospel, and in the still hours of night labored with his hands for his own and his companions' support, that he might not be burdensome to the congregations, and to leave them and all ministers of the gospel a lofty example of self-denying love for imitation! But above all we would hold out to view, the most sublime model of all virtue and piety, our adorable *Saviour*, to whom these and all saints look up with reverence and humility, from whom they receive all power for good, who exchanged His divine majesty for earthly poverty, to make us rich, who during

His earthly life, had no where to lay his head, that we might thereby be made partakers of His eternal glory!

5. Finally, however, we would not forget, that the chief matter and the first duty of the Christian in the end after all is to devote *himself*, his person, his heart, and his life to the Lord, who died for him, and that all other gifts of love lose their worth, when they do not flow from this great personal offering and from a living union with Christ. We may indeed overvalue external charity, if we separate it from its proper fountain. The apostle speaks of a sacrifice, that bestows all its goods upon the poor, and gives the body to be burned, but which after all is destitute of true charity, and therefore it profiteth nothing, (1 Cor. xiii : 3). Out of a living union of our whole person with Christ, alone sprout genuine piety and virtue, and with it also genuine charity and benevolence. If we have once surrendered ourselves, our heart and life to the Lord, then it will be a small thing for us, to devote our money, this dust of the earth, to His kingdom. Therefore let us,—this is the surest way to systematic benevolence,—above all things labor with this end in view, to present ourselves and our congregations as a living sacrifice to the Lord, and to be as closely united to Him as the branch to the vine, the member to the head, so that we shall no more live, but Christ live, think and will in us, speak and testify out of us, and work and accomplish through us acts of seeking and saving love. Ministers and laymen of the German Reformed Church, let us not only commit to memory, but lay to heart, and act out in our lives, that precious answer to the first question of our excellent Heidelberg Catechism : “That I with body and soul, both in life and death, am not my own, but belong to my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ.”

*Mercersburg, Pa.*

P. S.

## THEOLOGY OF LINGUISTICS.

THERE are but three possible hypotheses in regard to the origin of language ; (1) that it originated in the necessities, and is the invention of man ; or (2) that it has its origin in the nature of the human mind, and is, therefore, in a sense, an instinct of humanity ; or (3) that it was communicated to man from heaven, and is, therefore, of divine original. The first of these opinions belongs only to that age of scepticism when it took its rise, and has long since slumbered in the tomb of the past. The second and third have much in common requisite to be noticed, in order to mark more precisely their points of difference. Both assume the truth of the following *postulates*.

1. That language is neither arbitrary nor conventional.
2. That articulate sounds have a natural adaptedness to express certain specific ideas.
3. That every articulate sound has a specific import.
4. That there is a general correspondence between the inward thought and feeling, and its external manifestation.
5. That these correspondencies are governed by analogies, real and supposed.
6. That the radical or primitive meaning of a root will be that which lies nearest the soul of man, and is most likely first to affect it.
7. That the fundamental laws of all languages must be essentially the same.
8. That *language* is the external manifestation of mind ; or, in other words, it is a nicely adjusted machine, the visible movements of which, reveal to us the invisible workings of the inner spiritual part, the soul of man.

Thus much is substantially assumed by both hypotheses. They differ, in that, while one supposes the significance of articulate sounds to arise solely, or mainly from the fact, that they are the proper instinctive expression of the feelings that originated them ; the other supposes the *expression* of certain feelings, by certain sounds, to have been of divine original, equally with the feeling itself. One regards language as the *going out* of human thought and feeling, in a human form, through the power, of human instinct ; the other, as the *leading out* of human thought and feeling, in a human form, by the power of the Creator. The first makes the objective word as truly human, as the subjective idea ; the other supposes the objective word to have been, at first, as truly divine, as the mind in which the

subjective idea is conceived, and that the one was formed for the other, by the power of Him who made all things out of nothing. According to the first of these hypotheses, there would be such a correspondence of language with the wants and feeling of the soul, as might be called the *Psychology of Language or Linguistics*. According to the other hypothesis, there might naturally be expected such a recognition of divine truths, inwrought into the very structure of language, as to raise a strong presumption of its divine original, and hence would arise a department of language, which might be appropriately termed the *Theology of Linguistics*. The latter view includes all that properly belongs to the former, and adds to it a divine element, making it as interesting to the Theologian, as to the Philosopher. Under the one aspect, language is regarded as the development of the faculties of the soul, through its own native instincts; under the other, it is considered the *leading out* of the soul by the power of God.

The title of this article is a sufficient indication of the opinion we have adopted, and we must bespeak the kind forbearance of our readers, if what we have to offer upon this new topic, should at first seem to them dry or uninteresting. If it shall be found upon examination to possess a tithe of the interest to others which it has to us, it will amply repay them for their trouble. It may not be amiss to suggest, in this place, some of the advantages which this view possesses over every other, in its application to things, as they actually exist. If language had its origin solely in the human mind, and if that mind remains essentially the same under all the variety of circumstances, in which it may be placed, no good reason can be given, why there should be such a variety of languages in the world; nor why the same language should be apparently so unlike, in different periods of its history. But if the first elements of language were communicated to man, in his primitive state, and have been delivered down from age to age, by tradition, then an obvious reason presents itself, why, under the mutations of time and circumstance, there should be, at this period of the world, such a variety of languages, and why, as we ascend toward the common fountain of all, we should find an increasing similarity between languages, whose descendants are as dissimilar as possible. Thus, nothing can be more unlike than the modern German, and the present languages of India, and yet, no one at all acquainted with the oldest Germanic languages, and the old Sanscrit, can doubt for one moment, that they were derived from a common source. So, too, those who

have paid any attention to the subject of Greek and Latin etymology, and compared the results with Sanscrit roots, can not doubt their original identity. These are points so well established among the learned, that proof is unnecessary.

There is not, however, so general an agreement among philologists, in regard to the affinity of the Semitic, with the Indo-European languages, though it seems to us that there can be no more doubt of the fact, than of the original unity of the Celtic, Gothic, Slavonic and Sanscrit languages. The radical identity of a majority of its roots, with those of the Indo-European languages, is unquestionable, and there are clear traces of affinity in the internal vowel inflections of the verbs as well as in the particles employed in composition and derivation. A few facts must serve as specimens. The Hebrew forms its tenses in the primary conjugation, by certain vowel changes, which are retained in a considerable class of Gothic verbs. The same change occurs in the suffixes of Sanscrit and Latin verbs, and traces of it are found in the Greek and Celtic verb:—

	Past.	Fut. and Pres.	Pp.	
Heb.	kA-tal,	yIk-tal,	ka-tUl,	to kill.
Moeso-Gothic,	bAnd,	bln-da,	bUn-dans,	to bind.
Ang-Sax.	bAnd,	bln-de,	bUn-den,	to bind.
Germ.	b-And,	bln-de,	ge-bUn-den,	to bind.
Eng.	sAng,	sIng,	sUng-en,	to sing.
Lat.	—At,	—It,	—tUs.—tUr-us,	(suffixes.)
Sansc.	—At,	—It,	—Uat,	(suffixes.)
Icelandic.	rAnn,	rEnn,	rUn-nit,	to run.

The *a*, is also prefixed to the past tenses of Sanscrit and old Celtic verbs, and inflected into *ai*, and *au*, forms the common prefix of the past tense of old Coptic verbs. By a still further inflection it become, in the Greek, *e*, and forms the prefix (temporal augment) of the past tenses of verbs in that language.

Again, the personal endings of Hebrew verbs are known to be fragments of Hebrew pronouns, and the same endings are found to a great extent, in all the Indo-European, and some other languages. This will be evident from a comparison of the suffixes in various languages.

	Sing.			Plur.		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Hebrew,	—i.-n,	t.-k,	—;	na,	tem,	—.
Coptic,	ti.-ni,	k.-t,	f.-s;	en,	eien,	eu.-sn.
Persian,	am,	ay,	ast;	aym,	ayd,	and.
Armenian,	em,	o.-r,	r.-to;	mkh,	kh,	n.

Sanscrit,	ami,	as,	at ;	amas,	ata,	anti,
Zend,	ami,	ahi	ti ;	amabi,	atba	onti.
Greek,	mi,	o-es,	e-en ;	men,	te,	en-enti.
Lith.	mi,	si,	ti ;	ame,	ite,	—.
Latin,	m,	s,	t ;	mus,	tis,	nt.
Moes. G.	—,	s,	th ;	m,	jith,	nd.
Ang. Sax.	e,	st,	th ;	ath,	on,	—.
Germ.	e,	st,	t ;	en,	t,	en.
Icel.	—	r,	r ;	um,	it,	—

The coincidences in the general laws governing these languages, of which the above are but examples, leave no reasonable doubt of a common origin. Nor do we suppose it will be seriously questioned, that the Semitic languages may be classed with the Indo-European. But when we ask for the multifarious languages of the Africans, and the aborigines of this country, the acknowledgement of a similar relationship, we shall not be surprised if the grave philosopher is disposed to deny our request. More especially, when we propose to class the monosyllabic and atactic language of the Celestial Empire, with the syntactic and polysyllabic languages of the world, we shall expect to be met with a sturdy denial. In regard to the languages of the Africans and Americans, we affirm no more, at present, than, that they have not yet been sufficiently studied or analyzed, to enable us to say what are *the roots* of these languages, and that until this be done, we are not prepared to decide how far they may be cognate. Yet, so far as any such examination and analysis has been attempted, the results point distinctly to an original unity with the other languages of the world.<sup>1</sup> In regard to the Chinese, we are not prepared to assent to the current opinion in regard to its utter diversity from every other tongue ; the reasons for which it may be incumbent on us to state before employing it as we propose to do in this article.

That the same degree of correspondence can be found between the Chinese, and the syntactic languages, as between the syntactic languages themselves, the very structure of that language forbids. The agreement, therefore, must be mainly limited to two points, the connection of the Chinese symbols, with the origin of alphabetic characters, and the essential agreement in form and essence, of the radical elements of the Chinese,

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Schoolcraft says of the Ojibwai (or Chippewa): "It may be premised, as a principle which our investigations have rendered probable, that all polysyllabic words, all words of three syllables, so far as examined, and most words of two syllables, are compounds."—*Lect. Chip., Sub p. 197.*

with monosyllabic roots still existing in polysyllabic languages. There are many curious and interesting facts connected with the first of these points; but we have no space for them, at present, though many of them would be pertinent to our inquiry. In regard to the other we lay down this proposition, as one capable of the most satisfactory proof, that, *if the Chinese Radicals are classified according to their primary meanings, cognate roots will be found in the polysyllabic languages, agreeing with those radicals, in form and essence, and also in the general laws of derivative ideas.* The correspondence of derivative ideas, is to be sought mainly in the derivation of the subjective idea, though there are many more correspondencies in the phonetic expression of the objective word, than could have been expected. A few examples, (for we can do no more than give examples,) will illustrate our meaning, and indicate the *mode* of proof by which our position may be established. In selecting examples we are obliged to confine ourselves to a few points, and we, therefore, limit the cognate roots to the Sanscrit and Hebrew, these being good representatives of two classes of ancient and important languages. We give first a comparison of the Chinese pronouns with the pronouns of the Indo-European languages, then an example of the classification of Radicals in accordance with the above suggestion, and subsequently a comparison of numerals. The authorities followed in this article, are MORRISON'S *Chinese Grammar*, and the Imperial French Dictionary by M. de Guignes, for the Chinese; ROSEN'S *Sanscrit Roots*, BOPP'S *Comparative Grammar*, and BROWN'S *Sanscrit Grammar*, for the Sanscrit; GESENIUS' *Lexicon* and NORDHEIMER'S *Grammar* for the Hebrew; and BROWN'S *Hebrew Hieroglyphs*, for the Hebrew and Chinese compared.

No one can read, ever so cursorily, BOPP'S *Comparative Grammar* of the Sanscrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German, and Slavonic languages, without being struck with the important part which the pronouns have performed in the formation of these languages. And who ever will take the trouble to compare the results he has thus obtained with the Chinese in its present state, must be even more forcibly struck with the coincidence of the laws and elements deduced by comparative philology, with the existing laws and elements of that language. The Indo-European pronoun of the first person, singular, has everywhere this peculiarity, that the nominative singular comes from a different base from the other cases. The two themes are (1) Sansc. *ah*; Zend, *az*; Gr. *εγ*; Lat. *eg*; Goth. *ik*; Lith. *asz*; Slav. *az*: (2) *ma*, *mo*, in all. The

Hebrew has *ani*, and the Coptic *anok*; the relation of which is clearly proved by Nordheimer, (§. 125). With these the Chinese *Go*, or *Ngo*; *I*, *Me*, is also clearly cognate: forming the point of transition between the *N*, and *G*, of the other bases, both of which are combined in the Coptic.

The principal element of the pronoun of the second person singular, is *t*, or *th*; in Sansc. *tva*; Zend, *thwa*; Goth. *thu*: Lat. *tu*; Gr. *tu*, or *su*; Heb. *attah*; Copt. *ntho*, *nthok*. The Indo-European languages all want the *n*, of the Coptic, unless the *na*, *ni*, of the Genitives is a relic of it. The Chinese pronoun of this number is *Ne*, *thou*, *thee*. Here, as before, the Coptic combines both elements.

The third person singular is variously modified in the Indo-European languages; but the theme in Sanscrit is *sa*, also becoming *ta*, with a demonstrative sense, *he*, *she*, *it*, *that*: Zend, *he*, *hoi*, Lat. *se*; Gr. *ei*; Goth. *sik*; Slav. *se*, *sy*; Lith. *saw*; Heb. *hua*; Coptic, *nthof*; Chinese, *tā*; Celtic, *se*, *si*.

The first person plural of the pronouns, if the opinion of Bopp is to be adopted, seems to be compounded of the singular and a pronoun of the third person, *sa* (*m* (*Bopp*, §§. 331, 333), variously modified. As a verbal suffix this pronoun drops the *s*, retaining only the *m*, or its equivalent *n*: and thus becomes similar to the Hebrew *ana* *h* *n* *u*. The common Chinese sign of the plural is *mún*; which is clearly cognate.

The second person plural is evidently formed from the singular of the same number, in the Semitic by adding *m*, or *n*; and the same is true in the Indo-European languages of the personal endings of verbs of this number and person. The Gothic, however, inserts a *j* before the ending, which is cognate with another sign of the plural in the Chinese, *ng e ù*; *j*, and *ng*, being commutes in Sanscrit. The Welch employs *wch*, and the Armenian *ek h*, as the personal ending of the verb of this person; cognate with which is the Chinese plural sign *ch à*.

The third person plural, in the Semitic languages, is formed by adding *m*, or *n*, to the singular. The form is various in the Indo-European languages, but the personal endings of the verbs of this number and person have generally *nt*. The pronoun from which this was derived is still preserved in the Welch, *hwynt*; and the Coptic, *nta u*, *they*. The Chinese plural sign *té ng*, has the same elementary sounds, but in an inverted order.

The correspondence found to exist between the Chinese, Semitic, and Indo-European personal pronouns, extends also to



the demonstratives and interrogatives of these languages, a few of which will be mentioned. The demonstrative base *t a*, *he*, *this*, and *that*, is the same in form and sense in Chinese, Sanscrit, Zend, Lithuanian, and Slavonic. In Greek, German and English, it has assumed the functions of the article. In Sansc. the *t*, sometimes changes to *s*, which in Zend becomes *h*, which is supplied by the rough breathing in the Greek, *sa*, *h o*, *ä*. With this compare the Chinese demonstrative, *ch ā*, *se ē*, *this*. The Old German *dis er*, *des iu*, *this*, and the Latin *iste*, *that*, *he*, which Bopp supposes to be compounds, (§§. 344, 357) are precisely the Chinese *ts ē i*, except in the transposition of the consonants in the Latin. The old pronominal base *i*, (Eng. *e*.) by which the Latin, German, and English express the idea *he*, in Sans. and Zend signifies *this*. In Chinese *e* (= *y* of the French writers) is both a personal and demonstrative pronoun, and signifies *he*, *she*, *it*; *this*, *that*. The demonstrative base of the Zend, *av a*, *this*, is cognate with the Chinese *p ē*, *this*, *that*.

The interrogative bases of the Sanscrit and Zend are *ka*, *k u*, *ki*; becoming in the Gothic *h v a*, *h v o*, *hi*, *sa*, *so*; old Saxon, *hu ie*; Middle Netherlandish, *wie*; Eng. *who*? The Chinese interrogatives are, *s ū y*, *who*? *sh ō*, *who*? *h ō*, *who*? *which*? *what*? The Latin *Qui*, *Quo*, are about equally related to the Sanscrit and Chinese.

In like manner Bopp traces the case endings of the Indo-European nouns, back to certain pronouns, most of which are employed in the Chinese in the same sense. Thus the case ending of the nominative (§. 134.) supposed to be from *sa*, *t a*, *he*, *this*, which is the form and meaning of the Chinese *t ā*, *he*, *she*, *it*; *t ā*, *that*. The case ending of the accusative is also supposed to have a pronominal origin, (§. 156) in the neuter *ta*, *sa*, *he*, *this*,—in the other genders, *m*, from Sansc. *ima*, *this*; *a m u*, *that*. The Chinese demonstrative, *n ā*, *that*, has the same force and form as the accusative *m*, while the neuter *t*, is similar to the Chinese *t ā*, *he*, *she*, *it*; *t a*, *that*.

It cannot be necessary to pursue this point further; the facts already mentioned, raising a presumption of an original unity of these languages which can neither be set aside nor gainsaid. A specimen of proof of another sort, is all our limits will now permit us to offer. We give below a list of one class of Chinese Radicals, expressing the same generic idea, by phonetic symbols of the same kind, but represented by characters of various kinds, comparing them with cognate roots in the Sanscrit and Hebrew. We take a root that is not onomatopoeic to prevent all doubt as to the inference that may follow the comparison. We give first

the Chinese word, in the orthography of Morrison, with the meaning from M. de Guignes, followed by the Radical significance deduced from the usage as compared with the symbol by which the word is represented: to which is added cognate roots from Sanscrit and Hebrew.

*Chinese Radicals signifying GOING.*

- Rad. 10. Jō, *to enter, go into*: R. S. *going-into*. Sansc. gā, yā, i, hi, ī. Chald. hūch, Heb. hā-lach, nā-chahh, (Inf. const. chehtheth: rad. chehh)<sup>1</sup>
- " 60. Chē, *to pace*; R. S. *going-by-steps*; Sansc. ikh, ūkh, ukh; Heb. hā-lach,
- " 162. Chō, *to run, journey*: R. S. *going-in-haste*; Sansc. chhu, ju, jyu, jhu; Heb. sā-hah.
- " 137. Chōw, *a ship*; R. S. *going-by-water, going-through*; Sansc. chai, jai, sai; Heb. tsā-bah, sā, hhāh.
- " 79. Chū, *a staff*; R. S. *support-for-going*; Sansc. ag, ij, khaj; Heb. sā-'had, ā-shāh.
- " 47. Chuēn, *a channel*; R. S. *place-for-going*; Sansc. chauch, sauch; Celtic, ran, *a lake*; cainned, *a channel*.
- " 35. Sūy, *to walk*; R. S. *going-by-littles*, av, shav, ghav ghiv; Heb. sūhh.
- " 157. Tsō, *the foot*; R. S. *instrument-for-going, or standing*. Sansc. stha, comp. Lat. sto, Gr. στα, σταω, ιστημι, *to stand*.
- " 156. Tsōw, *to walk, to run*; R. S. *going-with-the-feet*, Heb. nā-hats, (Inf. const. hetseth, rad. tse) comp. Eng. *step*; and by transposition Latin *pes*; Gaelic *stap*.
- " 85. Shūy, *water*, R. S. *going-out, issuing, oozing*. Sans. su, oj, shrā, snā. Heb. kā-yāh, shā-gog, shā-gahh, yā-zah.
- " 56. Yūy, *to dart*; R. S. *going-swiftly, darting, shooting*. Sansc. jhā, ji, shī.
- " 54. Ying, *a journey*; R. S. *going-about*; Sansc. jyu; Heb. sā-hhar.
- " 144. Hing, *to go, to do*; R. S. *going-to-ones-labor*, rin, kan,\* Heb. nā-hag, (Inf. const. heggeth, rad. heg).

<sup>1</sup> The following laws of correspondence govern the relation of roots in the Hebrew and Indo-European languages. Hebrew roots with three perfect consonants should generally be compared in the *Infinitive construct*, as ga-nab, g'nob, *to steal*, (knab), ga-roz, g'roz, *to cut off*, (graze), ta-ram, t'rom, *to trim*. Hebrew roots defective *Pe Nun*, generally drop the *Nun*, in Indo-European roots, as na-vaf, *to wave*; na-kaf, *to cuff*: and roots with one imperfect letter in Hebrew, generally want that letter in the other, as ba-rah, *to bear*; da gah, *to deck*.

<sup>2</sup> The lingual *ṭ, ṭh, ḏ, ḏh, and ṣ* of the Sanscrit, are distinguished from the dental *t, th, d, dh, and n*, by being printed in SMALL CAPITALS. Long vowels of the various languages are marked; all others are short. The Hebrew orthography is Nordheimer's.

- " 146. Ya, *to oppose*, R. S. *going-against*; Sansc. kshi, chi, ji, si, yu, agh, jij, sarr, sharr, yudh; Heb. gûd, kid, sûr.
- " 145. E, *garments*, R. S. *going-over-and-around, investing*; Sansc. i, chi, styai, guth, héd, yam; Heb. sùg, sùk, sâ-char.

The roots given above as cognate all agree in generic, and generally though not always in specific application. The specific differences, however, are not greater than are common to the same word, as employed in different languages known to have come from the same stock. A single example from among the many coincidences in the derivation of secondary ideas, to be found in the Chinese and other languages, must suffice. The Chinese character called P a ô, and which is the representative of *rolling, turning, and winding*, is also called L ê ê, or L y, and signifies *binding, taking, strength, subtilty, etc.* Chinese L ê ê, *binding, taking*; Sansc. *la, lut, lôt, lû, luth*: Heb. *lûl, lû'h, lûh*, Latin *ligo*. From the idea of *binding*, comes that of *firmness, strength*; Chinese L ê ê, *strength*, like the Heb. g â - v â h, (1) *to wind, bind, twist*: (2) *to be strong*; and the Sansc. *tuj, to bind, to be strong*. From the idea of *winding* comes that of *wrapping-up, concealing*. Chinese L ê ê, *subtilty, deceit*; Sansc. *lu th, to take privately, to steal*; *lu nt, to deceive, conceal*; Latin, *lateo, to lurk, skulk*; Gr. *lanthanô, to be concealed, unknown*; Celtic, *luid, to lie, deceive*; Anglo-Saxon, *lig, a lie*. The same idea is retained in the Hebrew *lû t*, and English *lot*. The A-S. has the same idea in *hloth, a band of robbers*. Other similar examples might be added to a very great extent if our limits would permit.

One other coincidence of a different kind must not be omitted. Etymologists are agreed that the idea of the *substantive verb* is too abstruse and metaphysical to be regarded as primary in the ordinary sense in which words are thus denominated. And yet the words employed to denote *existence*, are so similar, in form and essence, in the Semitic and Indo-European languages, that no one hesitates to assume their original identity. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt that the Chinese words employed to express this idea, were from the same source, as will be evident from the following comparison.

Chinese—tsaé, shô, bef, wef or oi, hé.

Coptic—ti, chi, sho, pe, ne, o, oi, au, el, thre, thro, onon, shopi.

Welsh—sy, syz, oez, by, bu, byz, au, elu, athu, ydi, mae.

Hebrew—yish, (= ish,) hâ-yâh (= ya,) hâ-vâh, (= vâ).

Sanscrit—as  
 Celtic—as, is  
 Latin—es,  
 Greek—is,  
 Gothic—is, es,

bhu (svu), av.  
 ba, be, bi.  
 fu (svi).  
 pe-lu.  
 be, ve, wa.

Of these verbs, the Chinese are, from the very nature of the language, *impersonal*; and the same is true of most of the Coptic and Welsh verbs of existence, though these languages conjugate the other verbs, through various moods and tenses. So also the Hebrew *is h*, or *yish*, is both a noun and an impersonal verb; its use being as nearly parallel as possible, to that of any similar word in Chinese. Facts like these, carry us back with an almost infallible certainty, to the time when all the nations of the earth, spoke a single tongue, from which we may suppose all the languages in existence to have been derived: for, if the radical elements of the atactic and monosyllabic language of China, can be identified as cognate with the roots of the syntactic and polysyllabic languages of Europe and Asia, it can hardly be doubted, that a thorough analysis of all the languages of Africa and America, will bring the roots of these languages within the same laws of influence. We can not hesitate, therefore, to conclude, upon strictly scientific principles, aside from the testimony of revelation, that the radical elements of all the languages of the earth, *so far as examined*, are identical, and that the same general laws of derivative thought prevail in them. And when we consider how various and dissimilar these languages are, we can not resist the conclusion, that science will eventually do for all others, what it has done for them.

But we must leave this point, upon which we have already dwelt longer than we had intended, to consider some topics more immediately bearing upon our present subject. But our limits will permit us to do no more, then give some examples of what we mean by the *Theology of Linguistics*, and to point out some of the benefits to be derived from the study of it. Some of the examples may not at first be apparent to all our readers, but we doubt not that reflection will lead them to see, that our inference must be allowed, unless some better solution of the case can be offered. Our first example will be drawn from the *Numerals*.

The Chinese represents the numbers from *one* to *ten*, by distinct characters and combinations of characters, all significant of ideas beside those of *number*. In other words, its numerals are also employed, separately and in composition, as nouns and verbs. Hence it is reasonable to infer, that *the idea* of the nu-

meral, is related to the idea expressed by the word, when not a numeral.<sup>1</sup> It has also three different series of symbols by which these numerals are represented:—the first being called “plain hand,” which is evidently primitive; the second more complex, called “formal hand,” employed in deeds, bonds, contracts and the like; the third called “running hand,” being employed in the lighter species of composition. The different characters representing the same number, are called by the same name, though utterly unlike and entirely independent of each other, excepting those which represent the number *five*. We shall speak mainly of the “plain” or primitive characters.

ONE. The Chinese character representing *unity*, called *yā*, and *ā*, is represented by a horizontal line with a slight turn at the end, closely resembling the linear figure of the *outstretched arm* in the Egyptian hieroglyph for the letter *a*. There would seem to be little doubt of their original identity. The significance of this character, in Chinese, is that of *unity*, *priority*, *beginning*, *perfection*; characteristics, which, in their highest and truest sense, belong to Deity alone. In correspondence with this, the old Egyptians employed this character, in a modified form, to represent God, as *all-powerful*; and the Hebrew retains the *idea* of the “outstretched arm,” as a symbol of Almighty power. The syllable *ya*, or *ye*, also enters into many names of the Deity. It forms the first syllable of *JEHOVAH*, or more properly *YEHOVAH*, if we may judge from the abbreviated forms, *YAH*, and *YO*. It seems also to be the first syllable of the Phenician *jao*, *jeuo*, Samaritan *jabe*, Latin *jove*. The identity of the words signifying *Unity* and *Deity*, is conspicuous in the Scandinavian *Odin*, *one*; and *Odin*, or *Woden*, *God*, *the chief of the Gods*. Bopp supposes this numeral to have come from a pronoun, and we see no reason why the demonstrative sense he ascribed to it, may not be granted. Indeed the old “*ha*” which he recognises in “*half*” and “*halt*,” may be better accounted for by referring it to “*ya*,” than he has been able to do.

TWO. The idea of *duality* is represented in Chinese by repeating *ya*, *one*. It is difficult to represent the name of the double character, in English, the final sound being a lingo-liquid, intermediate between *l*, and *r*, and approximating to, if not precisely

<sup>1</sup> Bopp, §. 331. “I do not think that any language whatever has produced original words for the particular designation of such compacted and peculiar ideas as *three*, *four*, *five*, etc.”

like the Sanscrit vowel, *lre*; which often becomes *āl*. The name is written by some *ûrh*, and by others *eûl* (= *ûl*), the last of which is probably the nearest the true sound. As a verb, this word in the second series of numerals signifies, (1) *to assist*, *to make strong*, (2) *to distinguish between*, (3) *to part*. It is worthy of remark, that the syllable, *él*, seems, in its first sense, to be identical with the Hebrew *el*, and Sanscrit *al*, to be *strong*, *mighty*; and in its second sense to be like the Chaldee *alu*, *see, lo, behold*. The Sanscrit *luj*, has both senses, and the same initial syllable, with the sense of *strength* and *sight*, is widely spread through all the Indo-European languages. The Semitic *Allah*, *Eluh*, or *El* and the Phenician *Il*, one of the names of the Deity, seems to be from the same or a similar root. The two generic ideas common to this syllable are *strength*, and *sight*, specifically, *God*, and *light*. Why these two ideas are associated, it may not be easy to tell, but of the fact, there is no doubt. If, however, we prefer the pronunciation, *ûrh*, to *ûl*, it is instantly allied to the Ethiopian, *ryj*, *to see, oversee, rule*, when the connection of the two ideas is obvious; Coptic, *ro*, *a king*; Sanscrit, *raj*, *to shine, to rule, rājā*, *a king*; Latin *rego*, *to rule, reign*; *rex*, *a king*. The English has both ideas in the words *rule*, and *ray*. We have also presumptive evidence of the association of these ideas, and of their relation to the notion of *duality*, in other languages; Cel. *Dia*, *Dic*, *Dé*, *God*; *dia*, *die*, *dé*, *light, day*; *dà*, *dó* *two*; Greek and Latin, *Ze-us*, *De-us*, *God*; *dies*, *day*; *duo*, *duo*, *two*. It is also worthy of the remark, that the Hebrew numeral *sh'nā'im*, *second*, and which comes from *shā-nāh*, *to repeat*, (as the Chinese denotes this number by the repetition of *ya*,) *to do a second time*; also signifies *to shine*. Bopp's account of this number is among the most unsatisfactory of all his labours.

THREE. The idea of *trinality* is expressed in Chinese by three *yās*, written one above the other, and is pronounced *sān*. When the three *yās* are connected by a perpendicular line, passing through the middle, the character is called *yō*, and *ouang*, and denotes *a lord, a king*; and also signifies *to rule, to govern*, and is especially characteristic of the Lord of Heaven and Earth. With a point above the line it is pronounced *chū*, and both names are applied to the Deity. The first of these syllables, *yō*, as a name of the Deity, has already been considered in speaking of *JEHOVAH*, under the head of *unity*; and *chū*, is essentially the same element. *Ouang*, may, perhaps, be radically the same word as the Latin *unus*, Gothic,

an, een, ein, etc., *one*. Omitting the upper yā, the character drops the name of yō, and takes that of shāng, (merely a modification of sān,) which also signifies *Lord*, and *king*. This word, with a change of final consonants is also a common epithet to denote sovereign power; Persian, *shah, a king*; *sah, three*; Sanscrit, *shala, shula, a trident, the threefold sceptre*; *shōla, to worship, to adore*; with which compare Hebrew *shelshah, three*; Hebrew *Shāddāi, almighty, omnipotent*, from *shā-dad, to be strong, powerful*. Similar association of the number *three*, with names of the Deity, is also found in other languages. The Indo-European languages all agree in calling this number *tri, thri, dri, or tir*, and the Germanic nations denominated the chief of their gods, *Thor, or Tir*. The Egyptians also called one of their gods *Tre*, and *Thoor*; which the Alexandrians turned into *Thoth*. Bopp attempts no explanation of the radical significance of this numeral, though in speaking of *four*, he suggests that they may have had a pronominal origin.

FOUR. The series of combinations by which the first of the Chinese numerals are denoted, ceases with *three, four* being indicated by a character representing *a man*, lying on a bed, or standing upon the earth, or perhaps both, and is called *Ssé*, or *Ssé*. As a noun the character in the second series signifies primarily, *earthly passions*; and as a verb *to cherish, or indulge the passions*. The Rad. sig. of the Chin. *four*, is, *a man of earth*. The etymology of the Celtic *keathair* (ceayair), Sanscrit *chatur*, Persian *chehar*, Russian *chetyre*, Latin *quatuor*, is doubtful. Bopp, §. 311, supposes it to be "three and one," but his reasons are far-fetched. The old Celtic *keathair*, resolves itself into *kéathair*; literally, *earth-father*, but whether the coincidence is incidental or actual we can not say. The root of the Sanscrit, Russian and Latin, and probably of the Persian also, is *chat*, or some of its cognates; of which the Sanscrit has the following, apparently related thereto: *guh, guth, chad, khat, to come*; *khat, to wish, desire, cover*; *kshid, to love*; *chudd, to bring forth a child*; *kud, to be lascivious*. If these roots are in any way related to the root of *chatur, five*, then the Welsh *ped-wair, ped-air*, and Gothic *fid-wor, five*, would seem to refer to the existence of man, as man, rather than to his origin, and might be compared with the Sanscrit *vid, to be, to exist*. The Gothic languages generally leave out of consideration origin and existence, as such, and simply represent the number by a word, which probably signifies *man*, in his character *as man*, that is "the



born," as will be seen under the next numeral. Comp. Sansc. *virah*, Lat. *vir*, Gothic *wair*, Icel. *ver*, Sax. *wer*, Celtic *fe ar*, Span. *varon*, *a man*, with Dut. Ger. *vier*, Frisic. *fi wr*, Dan. *fire*, Swed. *fyr a*, Sax. *feow er*, and Gothic, *fid wor*, (like the Welsh *ped war*,) *four*. But whatever doubt may attach to these etymologies, there is none in regard to the Hebrew, *ar'bah*, *four*, where aleph is prosthetic, and wanting in the derivatives. The root, therefore, is *r'bah*, a derivative from *rā-ba'h*, which denotes (1) *to lie with*, in the sense of bestiality, *to engender*, (2) *to be four* sided, footed, etc.<sup>1</sup>

Why the three first numerals should be described by names which have been appropriated to the Deity, in the ancient languages generally, and why this practice is limited to these *three*, and why the *fourth* should introduce us to a being of such entirely different character, and be described by terms and figures so unlike the preceding, are questions it will be difficult to answer, unless we assume the divine original of language, communicated to man, in its first elements, by a Triune Creator.

FIVE. The Chinese symbol for this numeral is *P a ô*, *to roll, to fold*, between two *ya s*, the last signifying *duality*. It would seem to signify, therefore, *involving two into one*, or more probably, *evolving two from one*. It is called *w o ô*, or *v ù*. The symbol in the second series differs from the first, only by adding the secondary symbol for *man*, *mankind*. This last is called *v ô*, and both are phonetically the same syllable, the root of which is cognate with *v a u*, in the Hebrew *h a-v a h*, hardened into *ā-b ā h*, and *ā-h a b*, *to breathe, live, desire, love, to be, exist, beget*. The Sanscrit has the same root in *a v, bh ū*, *to be, exist, increase, love, v e*, and *v ē v i*, *to desire, to beget*; cognate with which is the Greek, *βω*; Latin *v i v o*; Celtic *b i*, *be o, to live*. With a slight change of orthography it becomes the *substantive verb*, that is the "living name," as the Chinese beautifully expresses it, or verb of existence which has been already considered. The Radical Significance of the Chinese *v ô*, is

<sup>1</sup> The Gothic numeral, may after all, be no more than the Hebrew, with the consonants transposed, in which case it would be cognate with the Indo-European *be ar*, *to produce, bring forth*. Such inversion was common when language was hieroglyphic, as we know the same Egyptian hieroglyph was read *Resho* or *Shore*; and the same cartouch gave *Resheph*, or *Sarfen*; etc. According to this view *man* would be "the born," which Borel §. 797. supposes to be the proper meaning of the Sanscrit *j a n a*, *man*; as in Latin, *h o-m o-n*, *the bring*.

<sup>2</sup> Some say of *L e ē*, *Strength*, but as the symbol for both is the same, we may choose that which gives the best sense.



the being, that is *man*; of *vù*, *two-beings-form-one*. This conclusion is favored by the opinion of Bopp, §. 799, where he shows that the Sanscrit *jāna*, *man*, signifies "the born," and the Latin *hō-mō*-is, *man* "the being." So the Sanscrit *vir-a*h, (from *vir*, *to be strong, robust*,) signifies "the-strong-one." The Hebrew *bar*, *a son*, (from *bā-rā*h, *to cut, to form, to create, to beget, to bring forth*,) like the Sanscrit *jāna*, *man*, signifies "the born," or "the begotten." From the Hebrew *hā-vā*h, comes the proper name *Eve*, "the mother of all living," which points to *woman*, made from *man*, as the significance of the symbol for *five*, and serves to illustrate the connection of the Hebrew *hō-mō*-es h, (1) *five, fifth*, (2) *womb, belly, abdomen*; with which compare Ethiopian, *hymys*, *womb*, and Latin *omāsum*, *abdomen*. The same facts furnish a natural explanation of the correspondence of the Gothic words for *womb*, and *five*: Gothic, *wamba*, and *fimf*; old German, *wampe*, and *fimfe*; Danish, *vom*, and *fēm*; Icelandic *vōmb*, and *fimm*; Saxon, *wamb*, and *fif*; Dutch, *wam* and *vijs*, or *vijbe*. These coincidences give an air of probability to the conjecture that *woman* is a compound of *womb* and *man*.

The Sanscrit and Zend, *pānchan*; Persian, *penj*; Lithuanian, *penki*; and perhaps the Greek *pentē*, *five*, seem to allude to another characteristic of the female. The Hebrew has the idea in its obsolete root *pā-nak*, *to be delicate, effeminate*; Arabic, *pā-nak*, *to live delicately*; Syriac and Ethiopian, *to delight oneself*. The Latin *quinq̄ue*, and the Celtic *kuig*, upon this supposition, might be related to the Greek *gunē*, *woman*; which must be referred to *genō*, *to beget*, and therefore signifies, "the begotten." A more full account of this root will be found on another page. The Saxon *fif*, and the Dutch *vijs*, have also an apparently close affinity with the Saxon *wif*, old German *wib*, *wip*, *wife*; which also appears to be connected with the Sanscrit *yābh*, signifying, *coire, concubere*. The leading idea of *four*, would seem to be "man,"—of *five*, "woman," being represented in the order of their creation.

Six. The Chinese character denoting *six*, is different from any thing that has preceded, being the symbol signifying *top*, or *summit*, over one signifying *things doubled*. Its Radical significance, is, *doubled summit*. As a noun it signifies *head*; as a verb, *to finish*. But to what it refers the symbols themselves furnish no means of judging. The character in the second series is compounded of *man*, *a farm or garden*, on *elevated ground*. Whether any reference is thus made to the completion

of creation, and the garden of Eden, it is impossible to say. The name of the character is, *lô*; which may, perhaps, be the root of the Semitic *el ûl*, the name of the *sixth month*, the etymology of which is unknown. This numeral is, in Hebrew and Persian, *shesh*; Sanscrit, *shash*; Russian, *shest*; Welsh, *chweck*; Greek, *εξ*; Latin and Gothic languages *sex*, *six*. The Sanscrit, *shash*, is intimately connected with, if not from the same root as *shish*, *to complete, to finish*. We can not yet affirm that *completeness*, or *finishing*, as connected with the *sixth* numeral has reference to the fact, that the work of creation was completed and finished on the *sixth* day; but the union of the two ideas in the same root, can not be so readily accounted for in any other way. It is also a curious fact that the Chinese "running hand" ends its system of characters with *six*; *seven*, being *six* and *one*; *eight*, *six* and *two*, etc.

SEVEN. This numeral is denoted in Chinese, by what is sometimes called the line of unity or perfection, passing through another figure, which forms the root or radix of the curve. It signifies *completion of the curve*, or a *complete revolution* and is called *tsê*. It seems to intimate that *seven* is a complete rotation or revolution. It also implies, that the division of time into periods of *seven days*, is co-eval with the origin of the numerals themselves; and it points to the fact, that, on the seventh day, God "rested from all the works that He had created and made," as the ground of that division. In accordance with this opinion, we find the ideas of *revolution*, and hence *binding*, and *uniting* or *measuring*, together with the idea of *resting*, involved in this numeral, in a great variety of languages. These ideas cluster around the Sanscrit roots cognate with its *saptan*, *seven*; *siv*, *to wind, turn about*; *sap*, *shamb*, *samb*, *to bind*, *shûp*, *to measure*, *sham*, *to be quiet, cease, rest, sleep, dwell*, *sâm*, *to quiet, please*, *shubb*, *to measure, create*, *sêv*, *to minister, worship, venerate*, *shap*, *to swear*. So the Hebrew *shêb-bâh*, *seven*, is intimately connected with *shâ-bâh*, *to bind, conquer*, *shûb*, *to turn, return*, *shâ-bath*, *to rest, to cease*, *shâ-bâh*, *to swear*. The Celtic *seach*, signifies *seven*, and a *turn*. The identity of this numeral in the Indo-European languages is unquestionable. Latin *septem*, Gothic languages *seofon*, Russian *sem*, Welsh *saï'th*, Icelandic *seö*, Persian *heft*, Greek *επτα*. As far, therefore, as any inference can be drawn from known facts, the ideas involved in the first seven numerals, are all drawn from circumstances connected with the creation; the three first referring to that *Trinity in*

*Unity*, which exists in God; the fourth, to man as created by God,—the fifth, to man as proceeding from man,—the sixth, to the completion of creation, and the seventh, to the rest that succeeded or followed it.<sup>1</sup>

EIGHT. The Chinese character representing *eight*, is the radical jō. which signifies *going*, but as a numeral receives the name of pā. The idea seems to be that of *going-forth*, i. e. from the completion of the revolution, and hence *increasing*. The Sanscrit numeral for *eight*, is a s h t a, which appears to be a derivative from a s h, *to go, to move oneself*, from which comes a k s h, *to increase, become large*, with which may be compared the Greek and Latin verbal ending—*sco*, forming augmentives. The same idea seems to have been retained in the Hebrew as s h'mōn ā h, *eight*, is nearly related to, if not derived from s hām ān, *to become fat, large*; Celtic, *ocht*; Greek and Latin *octo*; Saxon *eahta*; Dutch *acht*; Icelandic *atta*; Gothic *ahta*; old German *ohto*; Russian *asm, vosem, eight*.<sup>2</sup>

NINE. The Chinese character representing this numeral is the Radical P a ō, *rolling, revolving*; denominated k e e u, as a numeral, and signifies literally according to the import of the character, *winding and turning*, without limit, and hence involves the two ideas of *spaciousness* and *strength*. As a verb k e e u, signifies *to collect, to increase*. It is the most perfect and honorable, and mysterious number of the Chin., as also of the Tartars, ancient Goths and Persians, being regarded by Zoroaster as divine.<sup>3</sup> In accordance with this idea, we find the Sanscrit n a v a n, *nine*, clearly related to, if not a derivative from n ī v, *to be large, strong, new*.<sup>4</sup> So the Celtic n o i, n a o i, *nine*, is cognate

<sup>1</sup> The second, or "formal hand" symbol for *seven*, in Chinese adds to the symbol for *seven*, the symbols of *wood, water, and the sacrificial knife*;—very plain intimations of the character of the day.

<sup>2</sup> The second or "formal hand" symbol for *eight*, in Chinese, is composed of the symbols for *the hand, the mouth,—strength, and the sacrificial knife*, and the meaning is, *a sacrificial operation, performed by the hand, at the command of a powerful superior*. One can hardly avoid thinking of *circumcision on the eighth day*, though we can prove no connection between them. It is important to bear in mind that many of the ancient nations practised this rite; as the Syrians, Phenicians, Midianites, Ammonites, Moabites, Idumeans, Egyptians, Troglodytes, Ethiopians, Arabians, Sabeans, Indians, &c.—*Lec. Cat. n. Barb. Ep. e. ix.*

<sup>3</sup> Burder Orient. Lit. p. 231. Chald. Orac. Zoro. in Cory. 277.

<sup>4</sup> The radical connection of *nine* and *new* was conjectured by A. Benary, (Berl. Jahrb. 1832, ii. p. 50), and is spoken of by Bopp §. 317, but neither of them have given as good grounds for the supposition as Brown, Heb.

with its *n u a*, *strong*, and *n ú a*, *new*. The Hebrew *t e s h a h*, *nine*, if from any root in that language, must be, (and there is no reason why it may not be,) a derivative from *ā-sh ā h*, *to be broad, ample, spacious, strong*. Welsh *naw*, Icelandic *niú*, Gothic *n i h u n*, Saxon *n i g o n*, Latin *n o v e m*, *nine*.

TEN. The Chinese character representing this numeral, is the line of unity or perfection, on the line of increment. Its literal import is, *ascent of unity*, and is called *sh ě*, and forms the clavis of things signifying perfection. The Sanscrit *d a s h a n*, *ten*, seems to be derived from, or related to, *d i k s h*, *to increase, grow*, *d h i k s h*, *d h ū s n*, *to ascend, go up*. The Hebrew *h's ā-r ā h*, *ten*, seems also to be from *h ā-sh ā r*, *to be straight, erect; to build, rear; to increase, grow rich*. Even the Gr. *δ ε κ α*, *ten*, may be connected with *δ ε κ τ η*, which seems to have *uprightness* as its radical meaning. Welsh *d è g*, Celtic *d e i c h*, Persian *d e h*, Icelandic *t i u*, Gothic *t a i h u n*, Dutch *t i e n*, Saxon *t y n*, *ten*.<sup>4</sup>

Such, in brief are the facts, in regard to the Chinese numerals, as compared with the names of the numerals of the polysyllabic languages of Europe and Asia, and they would seem to leave no doubt of a *common idea*, even where the words by which those ideas are expressed are altogether unlike. Of the pertinency and force of the conclusions we have drawn in regard to this matter, as well as of the theological inferences flowing from them, our readers must be the judge, though it is impossible for us, by any description, to make them *see*, what they would instantly *feel*, if the whole subject were opened before the eye, instead of being but partially described to the mind.

But we must not leave this point without adverting to another fact, which goes to show how closely the numeral system is bound together at its base, however differently it may appear in its various developments. Improbable as it may seem, at first thought, there are strong reasons for surmising, that the Arabic and Roman characters representing the numerals, to ten, unlike as they are, have both come from the same source as the Chinese. The Chinese plain or primitive hand represents the three first numerals, by *one*, *two*, and *three*, horizontal lines, while the

---

Hiero. pp. 202-204. The symbol for *nine* in the "running hand," of the Chinese makes a curious allusion to *begetting and birth*, in which the ideas of *new-being-in-nine months* seem to be blended.

<sup>4</sup> The second or "formal hand" symbol for *ten* in Chinese signifies *hands-joined* and hence *ten-fingers*; thus giving countenance to the opinion of Jäkel, *Germ. Orig. Lat.* p. 98, adopted by Bosworth, in *TYN*.

running hand represents the same numbers, by the same number of perpendicular lines. This last is identically the old Roman and Egyptian mode of representing these three numbers. If, now, we compare the Arabic figures for these numerals with the Chinese and Roman characters, there can be no doubt as to the identity of the sign of *unity* in all. Nor will there be any more doubt of a general agreement of principle in regard to the mode of representing *two* and *three*. The Sanscrit, Persian, Arabic, and most of the dialects derived from or connected with them, denote *duality* by a character composed of *two horizontal lines*, united in a running hand, thus, Z. The Persian unites *two perpendicular*, and some of the East languages *two oblique lines* in a similar manner, for the same purpose. The Sanscrit, Arabic and Persian combine *three lines* in a similar manner to signify *trinity*. These lines can hardly be any thing but abbreviated y a s, thus making the Chinese, Sanscrit, Arabic, Coptic, Persian and Roman characters representing the three first numerals clearly cognate. Those who will compare all these characters, in their ancient forms, can not doubt this conclusion for a moment. But though these languages all correspond thus far, they all adopt a different principle of notation at *four*, save only the Coptic.

Those acquainted with the Chinese, will see at once, that the Roman character for *four*, (IV,) may be the same as the Chinese character for four, (IL,) without the border, having the right limb of the second character slightly elevated.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the Arabic numeral is the same figure with the left hand character drawn across the right limb of the other, (4,) changes which are less than many characters undergo in composition in that language. The Sanscrit retains what seems to have been the original form of the Chinese character for this numeral, except that the hieroglyph of the man stands on the outside of the circular border, instead of within it (8). The present Roman numeral for *five* (V,) is the same as the letter V, of that alphabet. But when we compare it with the ancient and present oriental modes of representing this number, a strong presumption is raised, that the coincidence is accidental. The Sanscrit figure for *five*, (I,) which is the Chinese v ù, (H,) inverted, omitting the horizontal lines, or y ā s inclosing it, may

<sup>1</sup> BROWNE adopts a different view, and conjectures a connection of the symbol for *four* with the original character from which the Hebrew has its *dath*, 7, the corresponding symbol in Phœnician and Runic bearing a striking resemblance to the Arabic digit for *four*.

be seen upon comparison, to have been the original of the Roman V, and Arabic 5, the present languages of the East supplying every link necessary to the change. The Roman character for *ten* (X,) is the same as the Chinese shē, in everything but its position, and seems to have come from the same source. The Sanscrit figure for *six*, is the Sanscrit figure for *three* inverted, with the sign of doubling, and the name of *six* in Persian, (shesh,) seems to be the name of *three* (seh,) repeated. The Sanscrit figure for *seven*, (𑖀) shows to the eye, what the Chinese speaks to the mind, *completion or revolution of the curve*. The numerals for *ten* (10) in Sanscrit, Arabic, Persian, etc., also speak to the eye, what the Chinese declares to the mind, *ascent, or advance, of unity*.

That these facts point to an original unity of symbol and idea, in all the various modes of thinking and speaking, prevalent in the world, far beyond what has been generally supposed, can not be doubted, whether all the conclusions of the present critic be accepted or not. Indeed, he does not suppose that every inference he has drawn, or every suggestion he has thrown out, will remain precisely the same as here stated, when all the languages of the world have been carefully examined and compared. But he has no fear that the general principle will be affected. The number of independent facts, drawn from such a variety of sources, all tending to the same point, will not allow him to suppose an utter want of principle at the foundation. That single, isolated facts, or even what may be called classes of facts, may be brought forward, that can not, at present, at once be explained by this hypothesis is to be expected. But they furnish no ground of objection to our position, if as we verily believe, this advances one step toward the solution of the great problem of language, further than any other which has been started.

But the theological bearings of philological inquiries, are not limited to the points or subjects already considered. We find many of the great truths of revelation, in-woven into the very structure of language, and many doctrines which sceptical reason has assailed, sustained by the unanswerable testimony of nature, and nature's God. Thus, we have seen, that the doctrine of *trinity in unity*, as a characteristic of Deity, belongs to the numeral system of all the ancient nations; and, that the language by which this is expressed, signifies that this Deity is the *first*, and *original* cause of all things, with *supreme* and *almighty power* over all, and that all things are *seen* of Him, being open and naked to His view. The same idea is found in other words applied to the Deity.

The Greek, *κατω*, Latin *centum*, a *hundred*, is of unknown, or uncertain etymology; but the Celtic, the elder sister of those languages has the same word, in the same sense, and the root of it, in its own vocabulary. Thus, it has *céd*, *cead*, *ceat*, *ceid*, *ceùd*, *cuth*, signifying to be *first*, *chief*, *head*; also to *shout*, *rejoice*, *praise*, to *celebrate*; and *gad*, to *pray*. It also has, *céd*, *cead*, *ceat*, *céud*, *céut*, a *hundred*, all of which are unquestionably from the same root; so that *hundred* is the head, or chief number. So the Sanscrit *shata*, a *hundred*, seems to be allied to *shat*, *shaut*, *shath*, *shad*, *shaud*, to *raise up*, *elevate*, *shout*, *rejoice*, *extol*, *praise*. Now the words, which in these languages, signify *first* and *chief*, and also *praise*, *adoration*, are employed in others, to signify, not the mere act or idea expressed by these words, but the being who is *first* in origin and power, *chief* in place and strength, and who should be the object of *praise* and *adoration*. Moeso-Gothic, *Guth*, Goth. Icelandic *Gud*. Anglo-Saxon *Guth*, God. Persian, *choda*. Hindoo, *khoda*, *codam*. Babylonian, *Gad*, *Gon*. A derivative from the same root, also signifies *good*; these denoting that "God is good," or *goodness*. Anglo-Saxon *gòd*, *good*. On the other hand a similar change in pronouncing the vowel in the Saxon word for *man*, produces a similar change of meaning, in the opposite direction. Thus the Sanscrit, Swedish, Saxon and Dutch *man*, German, *mann*, Icelandic, *mannr*, *madr*, Danish *mand*, Welsh *manac*, is *man*; but the Saxon *man*, Swedish *men*, Danish *meen*, Icelandic *mein*, signify, *vice*, *sin*, *wickedness*. The English has a word nearly related in its *mean*, *meanness*.

The Chinese *sin*, signifies *sourness*, *bitterness*, *acidity*, *sharpness*, *narrowness*, and the Radical significance of the symbol is, *unlimited-increasing-sharpness*, which is not a bad description of *bitterness*, and especially of the *bitterness of sin*. The Sanscrit *shan*, signifies *sharpness*, and *san*, *servitude*; whence it is reasonable to infer that the idea lying at the root of both words, is *bitter servitude*. This, however is the consequence, not the cause of *sin*, which is a *turning away* from the path of duty, *altering*, or *varying* from the path of rectitude. The Celtic has traces of this thought *sainim* (from *san*) to *turn from*, *alter*, *vary*; *seanaim* (from *san*) to *turn from*, *deny*, *refuse*; and the Gaelic has *saine*, *discord*, *strife*. The Greek *sinô*, to *hurt*, *injure*, *destroy*; Heb. *sânê*, to *hale*; Chal. *sh'nâh*, to *change*, *alter*, *transgress*, seem to have a trace of the same root. And perhaps, also, the Latin, *sons*, *guilt*.

According to the teaching of Holy Writ, *heaven* is a place of peace and rest, high and lifted up above the turmoil and cares of earth, while *hell* is a place beneath, hidden and concealed, a place where darkness and blackness reign forever, ideas which enter into the very essence of the words themselves. Thus the Hebrew *shâmâh*, the root of *shâmâyim*, *the heavens*, is closely con-



nected with *shābāh*, the root of *shābāth*, to rest, differing from it only in the common change of *b*, to *m*. The root *shābāh*, or *shāb-a-h*, belonging to the same class, also signifies to please, satisfy, etc. That the same root also signifies highness, is evident from the Arabic *shama*, to be high. The Sanscrit *sham* and *sām* signify to be quiet, to rest, repose; and the first, also, to be wonderful, high, invisible. So also the Celtic *saimh*, and Gaelic *shaimh*, denote rest, repose, etc; while the Chinese *shāng*, signifies both heaven and high. So the Saxon *heofon*, Dutch, *heaven*, *heaven*, are derivatives from *hebban*, to raise, elevate, and signify literally, that which is elevated, or high. The association of the idea of rest and peace with this word, is seen in *haven*, which to the ear of a foreigner, is identical with our word *heaven*.

The word *hell* is in Hebrew *shēōl*, which is a derivative from *shā-hal*, to be hollow, cavernous. This root also signifies to ask, inquire; and the common idea seems to lie in the idea of turning and leading, (1) turning or leading after, and hence asking, seeking; (2) turning or bending over, and hence covering, concealing. The Sanscrit expresses the same ideas by roots, which are nearly related, *syāl*, to seek, ask for; *hul*, to cover over; *hillil*, to revolve. And the Hebrew has cognate roots without the sibilant, *hūl*, *hāl-lal*, to turn, whirl; to bore, perforate; and hence to hollow out, excavate. The Gothic languages express all these ideas by words from the same root. Thus the Saxon has *hel-an*, to *hull*, conceal, cover over; *hill*, a hill, mountain; *hol*, a hole, cavern, den; *hell*, the grave, a tomb. The idea in all is that of something hollowed out, or covered over; like the Greek and Latin *Tartarus*, *hell*, which literally signifies, turned or covered over and around, and is hence said to be dark and black.

The word *eternity*, is also a most expressive term in this connection; literally, *revolving-age*, or *ever-rolling-cycle*, of which the *revolving circle* is an appropriate and expressive symbol. Equally emphatic is the word *ever*. The root is the Sanscrit and Coptic, *i*, Greek, *ei*. Latin, *eo*, *ire*, which becomes *aei*, in Greek; *aiw*, in Moeso-Gothic; *oe*, in Frisic; *a*, *aa*, in Saxon, and *ai*, *aye*, in English, the literal import of which is, *going*. In the strengthened form, Greek, *aiōs*, Latin *ævum*, English *ever*, its true import is, *going, going*; a most expressing and emphatic symbol of eternity.

But leaving these general topics, we must advert briefly to some points bearing upon particular articles of faith. We have already seen that the ideas of *unity*, *duality* and *trinity* as characteristics of the Deity belong to the very essence of language. But thus far we have seen nothing touching the relation of these ideas to each other. That there is *one* God, by whom are all things, for whom are all things, and who is over all things, necessarily follows from points already established. We shall now inquire what light can be thrown upon the relation of these ideas, by the aid of comparative philology.

The relation of the three persons of the Trinity, has ever been described in the Christian system, as the *Father*, who beget, — *Son* who is begotten, and the *Holy Ghost*, who proceeds. Hence arose, at a very early period, the expression, *the eternal generation of the Son*, as descriptive of His relation to the Father. This expression has ever been rejected by those who denied the essential divinity of the Son, and latterly by many who professed to be desirous of holding the truth in regard to the ever blessed Trinity. The objection is, that the language is philosophically absurd and contradictory. The decision of this question, upon philological principles, depends upon the true and primitive meaning of the term *generation*.

The Gr., γεννητος, *generated, begotten*, must be carried back to the obsolete GENO, as its root, the various meanings of which are preserved in γυνωμι; and which are, *to emanate, arise, spring from; to become, to be born, to be produced, to live; to chance, to happen*. The Latin genero, *to beget, engender, produce*, is from the same source, and both may be carried back to GEN, as the root, which must itself be referred back to GAN, or GIN. The Sanscrit has the same root, with the *g* softened to *j*, in jīn, *to arise, come into view, to be born; (causatively), to produce, engender, beget*. The Celtic has the same root in gin, *to sprout, spring forth*; and in a strengthened form gein, *to beget, produce*. The Frisic also has the same root in kinio, *to sprout, spring forth; to erect, to stand up*. The Hebrew cūn, *to stand erect, to form, create*; and which in Arabic and Ethiopian, also signifies *to be, to exist*, is also from the same source. The old Gothic had the root, as is evident from its kunī, *a race*, as also from the words *kin*, and *kind*, derivations from the same root abounding in all the Gothic languages.

But there is an ultimate root back of all these,<sup>1</sup> as is evident from the Sanscrit jīn, which the native grammarians carry back to gā, (1) *to go, go on, go forth*, (2) *to praise, extol*, (3) *to generate, beget*. This root, (gā) as we have already seen, is common to both Chinese and Sanscrit, (Chinese, jō, jy, etc., Sanscrit, gā, yā, yū, etc.,) in the same sense, to which we may add that it is common to all the Indo-European languages. The radical thought, therefore, in all this class of words, is, *going forth, coming into view*, and hence *arising, being born, proceeding from*. Conse-

<sup>1</sup> Although the Sanscrit has preserved its roots in a truly wonderful manner, beyond all parallel in the other languages, not every word set down in the books as a root, is to be considered a *primitive* word. Most double final consonants in Sanscrit have arisen from the insertion of *R. L. N. V.* and *M.* before the final consonant; generally, without any change of radical meaning, thus making the truly primitive words akin to the Chinese Radicals. The Sanscrit also sometimes adds letters when the cognate languages want them, *shlish*, *to lash together*, *matr*, *to meet*, *mishr*, *to mix*, *chhidr*, *to cut*.

quently the idea of *begetting*, in the sense in which it is applied to created beings, is its secondary and causative sense, and not the primary meaning. In its true primitive sense, it belongs to the Son of God alone. The true meaning of the phrase "eternal generation," as applied to the Son, is therefore that *from all eternity, he has sprung forth from the substance of the Father, and yet remains in the bosom of the Father, distinguished, but not divided from Him*. Unless, then, there are some objections to this mode of reasoning, which do not occur to us, the phrase in question, is not only proper, but is the most emphatic and descriptive that could be chosen.

To this it may be added, the very name by which the Son is known,—the very word *son* itself, signifies the same thing. The nouns derived from the root we have been considering signify different things, in different languages: Sanscrit, *jān*, Chinese *jīn*, Armenian *gin*, *a man*; Gaelic *gin*, *a person*; Coptic *ken*, Chinese *kien*, *a son*; German *kind*, *a child*, etc. The Sanscrit has *sū*, *to go, to move oneself, to beget, to rule*; *snu*, *to go, to go out, to flow forth*; *shan*, *to go, to go forth*. The first root *sū*, is cognate with the Chinese *seù* (a symbol of infancy;) and from it comes the Sanscrit *sūnū*, *a son*; Saxon *sūnū*, Gothic *sūnūs*, Danish and Swedish *son*, German *sohn*, Frisian *sūn*, Dutch *zoon*, Icelandic *sonr*, Russian, Polish and Bohemian *syn*. The word *son*, therefore, signifies *that which has proceeded forth*, and is applicable to *Christ* alone, "the only begotten son of God," in its strictly primitive and literal sense.

It may be added that the name *Father* applied to the first person of the Trinity, implies the same thing. The word *āb*, *a b*, *e b*, signifying *father*, in the Hebrew and kindred dialects, also signifies *origin*, and *source*. In accordance with this idea, the Persian *āb*, signifies (1) *a fountain*, (2) *water*, as something proceeding from a fountain. This, or a similar word, with or without the addition of final letters, is the root of the word *father*, in Chinese, Sanscrit, Zend, Greek, Latin and its derivatives, Gothic and all its derivatives, Hindoo and Turkish, and no doubt in many other languages not examined. That the idea of *source* or *origin*, is the radical thought in this root, there can hardly be any doubt, when we look at other derivatives. The English preposition *of*, signifying *out of*, or *from*, and the cognate preposition in all the Gothic languages, can be traced back to such a root. The Sanscrit has numerous words beginning with the syllable *pā*, *pī*, and its cognates, all having the significance of *going*, *going forth*, *moving*, as their primary meaning. It has also the preposition, *apā*, *out of*, *from*, and *avā*, *from*. The same preposition occurs, in the same sense, with only the common dialectic changes, in Dutch, German, Danish, Swedish, Icelandic, Gothic, Saxon, Welsh, Latin, Greek, etc.

That the relation of the Son to the Father, is that of *out of* or *from*, is evident from the mode of deriving proper names. The Celtic *O*, Scotch *Mac*, *Mc*, Welsh *Ap*, Dutch *Van*, German *Von*, prefixed to proper names to denote *Son of*, are also prepositions, denoting *out of*, *from*; while the Hebrew *Ben*, and Syriac, *Bar*, prefixed for the same purpose, are words denoting *son*. In English this principle is still more strongly confirmed, since it employs the common ending of the Genitive case, in forming Patronymics or Surnames, along with words denoting sonship. Thus we may say, *William-s* or *William-son*, *John-s*, or *John-son*, *Wilkin-s*, or *Wilkin-son*, *Thom-son*, *Thom-lin*, *Thom-kin*, *Thom-kin-s*, or *Thom-lin-son*, etc. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the idea of relationship between Son and Father, is that of *proceeding from*, or *out of*; and hence, it is only in a secondary and cursative sense that the idea of *begetting* is attached to the word, or can be applied to man.

Another name applied to the Saviour is that of the WORD of GOD. Now in a philological point of view, any *word* may be considered in reference to these points.

1. Its *sound*, as spoken, what declares, (*voice*).
2. Its *sense*, as to the idea, what is declared, (*idea*).
3. Its *matter* or *form*, as written, how declared, (*written word*).<sup>1</sup>

Judging, therefore, upon purely philological principles, we have the following facts and conclusions. If the term, WORD, be applied to CHRIST, in the strict and proper sense, we must have.

1. What declares—the Son.
2. What is declared—*Revelation*.
3. How declared—*Holy Writ*.

Consequently, in Revelation we must have a full idea of the Son, who declares or makes known, and in Holy Writ a full description of what is declared, so that Revelation and Holy Writ must be co-extensive. Hence, therefore, there can be no Revelation or Word of God distinct from the Personal Word, or independent of the Scriptures, as some vainly pretend; unless the term WORD of God be applied to our LORD, in a secondary and derivative sense.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Name *Word* is more closely connected in the languages of the world, than at first appears. The root of the whole class of words is the Sanscrit *brū*, Zend *mru*, to speak, tell, declare. Sanscrit *BRU*, to speak, say, tell, declare; *BRaVa*, speaking, speech, discourse; *VBrT*, to shine, speak, enlighten; *VRiDH*, to enlighten, speak; *VarTH*, a word, speech, discourse; Celtic *FOR*, speech, discourse, enlightening; a law, command; Hebrew *aMaR*, to enlighten, speak, declare; *EMe*, a word, discourse, command; *DaBaR*, to guide, direct, speak; *DaBaR*, a word, discourse, reason, cause; Latin *VeRbum*, Gothic *WaurD*, Saxon *WoRD*, Icelandic *oRD*, a word; Greek *ερω*, to speak, say, tell.

Again, *faith*, in its theological sense, signifies that act of the soul, which so unites man to God, that the Christian may receive from the Saviour, that grace or life, which shall make him a new creature in CHRIST, that is, a Son of God. Faith, therefore, is that act of man, which so unites man to God, that he may receive that which shall make him a Christian. That this is an act of *the heart*, or *soul*, rather than of the intellect, the Celtic and Latin languages clearly intimate. Thus the Celtic from the root, *cri*, *the heart*, has *cre*, *faith, belief*; and *cre-i-d*, *to believe*; Latin *cor*, *the heart*, *cred-o*, *to believe*. The Greek *κρίσις* is from the obsolete root *κρίω*, *to bind, make fast*, like the Sanscrit *pi-d*, *pi-t*, *to bind together*, *badh*, *to bind*, *budh*, *to make sure*, *pad*, *bad*, *vad*, *to be firm, fast*.<sup>1</sup> From this root comes the English word *faith*; which therefore signifies *binding* or *uniting the heart to God*.

*Trust*, another word of this class, is from the same root as *true*, which seems to denote, primarily, *that which is fast, firm, constant, enduring*; cognate perhaps with the Sanscrit *dh-rû*, *to be firm, stable, enduring*, and the Hebrew *dâ-har*, (1) *to revolve*, (2) *to endure, last*, *dûr*, (1) *to revolve*, (2) *to remain, endure*; *dôr*, *an age, generation, eternity*. *Belief*, from the Saxon *Geleafa*, has for its ultimate root, *la-f*, identical with the Sanscrit *labh*, *to receive, hold*. Hence, according to the primary, and strictly literal meaning of language, *credence* signifies that act of the heart or soul by which it *believes*; *belief*, that which it *receives* and *holds*; *faith*, that which binds or unites the subject and object of belief; and *trust*, the endurance or continuance of that union.

Such are specimens of facts which abound in the science of philology, and although they may not furnish ground for definite conclusions they raise presumptions of the strongest kind, that this department of knowledge is to become, in an especial manner, the handmaid of religion. We are very far from wishing to wrest the facts of science, from their legitimate scope and bearing, to sustain any theory,—much less to press them into the service of that science which rests on the authority of inspiration. At the same time, when all known facts in regard to a particular subject, tend to the same point, we are not to close our eyes to the conclusions which they force upon our minds, because they are higher, deeper, or holier than any which the mere man of science, or the sciolist in theology chooses to allow. If all the languages of the world, *so far as they have been examined*, point to an original substantial unity of speech, of which all the various languages of the earth would seem to be circumstantial varieties, we are not to reject the conclusion, because it happens to be in accordance with the testimony of

<sup>1</sup> In the Sanscrit *bad*, *to be strong, powerful*, we have another example of the idea of strength, derived from that of binding and winding.

Scripture. But we must be careful to distinguish between facts and inferences, lest we really weaken the arguments we wish to maintain.

While, therefore, we believe in the existence of one Original, Independent, Self-existent, First Cause of all things, from whose Eternal Omnipresence and Power all things proceed, we should naturally be led to suppose, that language would be one of the parts of that system in which the Divine Mind had adapted part to part, and hence that both the *word* and the *idea* would be alike traceable back to God as their first cause, and that one would be no more dependent upon accident or human invention for its existence than the other. Hence, we are led to suppose, that both the objective word and the subjective idea were at first communicated to man, and perhaps also the symbol by which the word and idea were represented. That language is not an instinct of man, similar to the instinct of the beast, is certain from the fact, that it has not remained permanent in all ages as that has done. That it is not dependent on human invention for its existence, or on use for the radical significance of its words, is rendered probable by the fact that so many roots preserved in modern words, can be traced back through a great variety of conditions and circumstances to the earliest ages, without having lost a shade of their original meaning. If language had been a thing of accident chance, or human invention, this perpetuity of original idea could not have been secured under all the mutations to which words have been subjected, without a miracle, greater even than would have been required for its creation.

If language had the origin we have supposed, we might expect its elements, *when properly understood*, to abound in recognitions of divine truths, of truths, too, which the unaided reason of fallen man could not find out. Such being the case, we might expect to find in the very structure of language itself, the impress or recognition of many of those solemn and mysterious truths which Revelation unfolds, so that Natural and Revealed Theology could be found, in the end, to be identical. This view of language accounts for the *similarity of idea* found in all the ancient religions, true or false, and also explains satisfactorily why these ideas have been so faithfully retained amid all the perversion and degradation of the religions in which they are embodied. The *idea* is in the very language itself, and can not be eradicated; though the application has been grossly perverted from its original object. Upon this supposition, also, the primitive revelations are not as dim and uncertain as modern minds have been accustomed to imagine. The revelation was in the *idea* and the *symbol* of the *idea*, whether mimetic or phonetic, and it was only as men lost sight of these,—only as men lost the true meaning of the *words*, that a revelation more external and full became necessary, and only when that took place, that it

was given.<sup>1</sup> It is the duty and should be the pleasure of the Christian Theologian, to search for the traces of these early revelations, as they have been embodied in, and transmitted by the ancient languages, to show their correspondence with the more full and circumstantial testimony of the inspired record, and thus to prove the correspondence of truth whether revealed in Nature or by Holy Writ.

It is because of the inherent and permanent sense of language, that *certain words* are recognized by the Christian consciousness of all ages, as the true exponents of *Christian Doctrine*, and hence, too, why that, the rejection of these words, and the substitution of others, has ever been regarded as evidence of departure from the truth embodied in them. If such words fail to convey to the mind of any individual, the sense which the church has ever ascribed to them, it is either, because, like the ancient heathen, he has lost the proper meaning of the symbol, or, like the ancient heretics, he rejects the truth which they declare. Many things, therefore, which appear to the superficial and unbelieving as mere logomachy, the man of true science looks upon as involving truths of eternal and momentous consequences. The original Unity and Trinity of the Godhead,—the eternal generation of the Son, and the procession of the HOLY GHOST—the relation of the Son to the Father; and the proper two-fold sense of the WORD of GOD, are of the number of the truths which sciolism rejects, but science justifies, which ignorance and unbelief would discard but which intelligent faith believes and will defend. Scarcely less shallow and unfounded, and not less pernicious, is the pretence, that language has no fixed and certain meaning, that the real thought which words represent varies according to the condition of the soul of him who employs them. Truth being absolute must be represented by something as absolute as itself, and unless language does this, we can have no conception of it as such, nor any evidence that what we regard as truth was so considered in ages past, no security that it will be so considered in ages to come. With these brief statements we must close an article perhaps already too long for the patience of our readers.

South Glasterbury, Ct.

A. B. C.

---

<sup>1</sup> Humboldt, *Cosmos* II. 477, has a remarkable passage from the Indian mythology in regard to China: "Truth was originally implanted in mankind, but having been suffered gradually to slumber, it was finally forgotten, knowledge returning to us since that period as a recollection."



## CYPRIAN.

THASCIUS CECILIUS CYPRIAN, the great ornament of the Latin Church in the third century, was born at Carthage, about the beginning, probably, of this period, of a highly respectable and wealthy family. His father, we are told, was one of the principal senators of that place. Of his secular relations, however, including his education and many years afterwards of prosperous worldly life, almost nothing is now known; his biographer, the Deacon Pontius, having judged all this to be of no consideration, and so not worthy of any historical mention, "in view of that spiritual greatness" by which he became so illustrious in the end. We know only that he was possessed of good natural parts; that he enjoyed the best opportunities for intellectual culture; that these were diligently and successfully turned to account; that he applied himself particularly to the study of oratory and eloquence; that he became professor of rhetoric subsequently in his native city, a highly honorable as well as lucrative employment in that age; that he prosecuted his profession with great reputation and success, ("*glorioso rhetoricam docuit*," according to Jerome); that he lived in elegant and genteel affluence, as a man of the world, devoted it would seem to mere pleasure and ambition, the lust of the eye and the pride of life, without God and without hope. He was a Pagan; and with all his secular cultivation the vices of Paganism held him firmly in their power.

In this condition however, according to his own confession, he was by no means happy. Amid the pleasures and honors of the world, he had a keen sense also of its unutterable vanity, and sighed frequently after higher and more enduring good. Christianity no doubt had some influence upon him in this way, long before he was brought to yield himself to its power. He could not but approve in his conscience its high purposes and aims; and there were aspirations in him at times, that would fain have burst the chains of sense and flesh, to make common cause with this divine philosophy in its heaven-ward flight. But he had no power to persuade himself, that what Christianity proposed in this case was in any way truly practicable. He saw that no merely natural ability or effort would be sufficient for any such end, the eradication of worldly affections and desires, the conquest of self, and a true surrendry of the heart to heavenly and eternal things; and it fell not in with his carnal wisdom, his natural experience and common sense,

to believe in any real provision for the purpose under a supernatural form. He knew, indeed, that the claims of the Church included the idea of such supernatural help; that powers more than human were supposed to be embraced in her constitution, for the accomplishment of its more than human ends; that her sacrament of regeneration in particular, was held to be not a powerless baptism with water merely, but an actual new birth by the Spirit into such a state of grace as brought with it the real possibility of righteousness and salvation, in a form wholly beyond and above the reach of nature. Of all this he had often heard; for it was part of the daily talk and universal faith of the Christian world at the time; but to his worldly judgment the thing appeared incredible. He was not able to acknowledge the mystery of any such supernatural grace; it appeared to him no better than a fanciful dream; and thus all his better thoughts and aspirations served only to fill him in the end with a more perfect feeling of despair, a sense of hopeless bondage to the power of this present world for which religion itself could offer no relief.

In his tract *De Gratia Dei*, addressed to his friend Donatus, soon after his conversion, he has himself given us a picture of the spiritual state in which he found himself, for some time at least, previously to that event. "I lay in darkness," he writes, "and floated on the world's boisterous sea, with no resting place for my feet, ignorant of my proper life, and estranged from truth and light. Circumstanced as I then was, I found it hard and impracticable to receive the promise held out by the divine goodness for my salvation; namely, that a man might be born again, and that being animated into a new life, through the laver of saving water, he might lay aside what he had been before, and though retaining the same bodily frame put on an entirely new mind and spirit. How is so great a conversion possible, I said to myself, that one should suddenly and at once put off what has either hardened upon him from his own nature or has become inveterate through long custom? These things are wrought, as it were with a firm and deep root, into his very constitution. When does one learn frugality, who has been accustomed to rich and sumptuous entertainments? And when does one who has been used to costly raiment, shining in gold and purple, descend contentedly to plain and simple apparel? He who has prided himself in honors and the insignia of power, cannot stoop to a private and inglorious state. He who has been surrounded with the officious attendance of numerous retainers and clients, considers it a calamity to be left alone.

So universally, it seems to be necessary, that through the seductive force of custom wine should continue to invite, pride to inflate, anger to inflame, covetousness to disquiet, cruelty to stimulate, ambition to please, and lust to hurry headlong in its own course. Such were often my private thoughts. For being deeply entangled in the manifold errors of my own previous life, which I considered it impossible for me to lay aside, I yielded thus to my besetting sins, and through despair of any thing better gave myself up to their power as an evil belonging to me by native and proper right."

This description refers particularly to the period immediately before his conversion, when he was led to think seriously of embracing the Christian salvation. He had formed an acquaintance with an aged and excellent priest in Carthage, named Cecilius, who gradually won his entire confidence, and whose influence on him was happily employed at the same time to engage his favorable attention to the claims of the Gospel. By him he was led to devote himself to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and finally to offer himself as a catechumen for admission into the Christian church. In this state of preparation, according to his biographer, he proposed to himself the highest ideal of Christian perfection; though he was far from being able at once to secure the victory over himself and over the world, to which his ardent spirit aspired. The full crisis of his conversion he himself refers to his baptism, which carried in it for his subsequent faith always the character of a real gift of life bestowed upon him by God. "When by means of the regenerating wave," he says, "the stain of my former life was washed away, and the serene and pure light of heaven descended into my sin-cleansed bosom; as soon as the second birth, by the Spirit derived from on high, had transformed me into a new man, presently in a wonderful way doubts began to be settled, perplexities to solve themselves, and obscurities to grow plain; there arose strength, for what before seemed difficult, and power to do what was before held to be impossible; making it clear, that the first natural life in the service of sin was of the earth, and that what the Holy Ghost had now breathed into me was of God"

Cyprian's baptism took place about the year 245 or 246, when perhaps he was not much less than fifty years old. He always regarded the priest Cecilius afterwards as under God the author of his spiritual life; and in token of his grateful affection towards him took his name into union with his own, calling himself from the time of his conversion *Thascius Cecilius Cyprian*.

He adopted at once what was then regarded as the highest rule of piety, devoting himself in a life of celibacy and voluntary poverty to the service of God. The Scriptures were made his favorite and constant study. He sold his estate, and gave the money as well as almost all he possessed besides, for the support of the poor; "by which," says Pontius, "he gained two ends of principal importance; renouncing and despising all secular views, (than which nothing is more fatal to the true interests of piety and religion,) and fulfilling at the same time, the law of charity, which God himself prefers to all sacrifices." With the study of the Scriptures he joined also that of the best ecclesiastical writers then known. Among these his great favorite was Tertullian, his own countryman, out of whose writings he made it a point to read something almost every day; calling for them as Jerome relates, with the simple word: "Hand me the Master." In a very short time, he was favorably known, we may say even distinguished, for his Christian knowledge and piety, on all sides.

This good reputation created a general desire, on the part of the people, to have him raised to the priesthood; and he was accordingly consecrated, while still a neophyte or recent convert, to this holy office; his extraordinary merit being considered a sufficient reason, for dispensing in his case with the rule, which forbade the ordination of persons of this class. Soon after Donatus, the bishop of Carthage died; and now there was a general cry, on the part of both clergy and laity, that Cyprian should become his successor. Of this dignity however he felt himself to be altogether unworthy; and protesting against his own nomination, with unaffected humility, went so far even as to hide himself by flight, that he might avoid the public pressure. But the place of his retreat was soon discovered; when the people laid siege literally to the house where he was, closing up every avenue of escape, and refusing to withdraw till he should yield himself to their will. He bowed himself accordingly in the end to the necessity which seemed to be imposed upon him so evidently by God himself, and thus became bishop of Carthage not more perhaps than two years after the time of his conversion. His consecration took place, with the unanimous approbation of the bishops of the province, in the year 248. With all this popular enthusiasm however, there was not a universal satisfaction with the appointment. A few of the presbyters, including Fortunatus and Donatus who had themselves aspired to the dignity, with some of their friends among the laity, opposed the election as being in favor of one

who was still only a novice in the church. Cyprian treated this party with great kindness, and bestowed upon them indeed special marks of his friendship and confidence; for the purpose partly of placing them on good terms with the body of the people, who were highly offended with their conduct. But they were not to be subdued in this way. All kindness was lost upon them; a deep grudge was still harbored in their bosoms against the new bishop, which only waited a favorable opportunity to break forth afterwards into open insubordination of the most active and violent kind.

Cyprian entered upon his episcopal duties with the greatest resolution and vigor. However backward he had been to undertake the office, there was no lack of zeal with him, when it had been undertaken, to carry out in full the proper sense of its functions. The energetic, uncompromising spirit, with which he insisted thus on what he conceived to be its rightful prerogatives and claims, has sometimes been regarded as the sign of a hierarchical nature, a disposition to lord it over God's heritage; in which view, to a carnal worldly mind, his previous deprecation of the episcopate must appear to have been no better than a politic feint or sham, a mere piece of mock modesty at best, in no true keeping with the ambition which actually reigned in his soul. Such also is the construction, which this carnal judgment is ever prone to put upon all similar instances of the *nolo episcopari*, as they come before us in the history of the ancient church. But let it be felt that Christianity is what it claims to be, and all this sort of thinking is at once reduced to its proper miserable worth. There is in truth no contradiction whatever, between the backwardness of Cyprian to become bishop, and the high church style in which he afterwards acted as a bishop. On the contrary, both exhibitions of character sprang from the same ground, the firm faith namely which he had in the divine origin of the church, and in the reality of the apostolical commission as something always of force in the succession of its priesthood. His humility led him to shrink in the first place from the honor and responsibility of a ministry, which he felt to be so directly from heaven; and the very same feeling substantially, the sense of what was due to such an office over against all simply private and personal ends, engaged him afterwards to use its resources, and assert its rights, with the most uncompromising zeal. He became in an important sense the organ of the high trust with which he was clothed. However humbly he thought of himself, he could not too much magnify his office. This was, not of man, but of God. However

much his election to it might have been due to the people, he never thought of resolving the office itself, its powers, resources, or rights, into any such popular vote. That would have been to his mind nothing short of absolute blasphemy. Every true bishop, in his view, was a successor of the apostles, and a real bearer of the commission which they received originally from the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. This was the consciousness in which he stood, and that actuated we may say his universal ministry. It is easy to see, how it might impart to this at times an air of something like pontifical assumption, as viewed from the standpoint of the common unbelieving world. But it needs only a slight knowledge of his life, a cursory acquaintance with the spirit that breathes through all his epistles and tracts, to be fully satisfied that his character was the very reverse in fact of every such unfavorable imagination. His hierarchichal ideas were all based, like those of St. Paul, on the renunciation and sacrifice of self. Never perhaps was there a bishop more truly humble, more self-denying, more gentle and affectionate, more ready to render himself up as a holocaust of love for the welfare of men or for the glory of God.

It is not too much to say of him, that he was the complete ideal of a true Christian bishop. His piety, his humility, his charity and benevolence, his gentleness combined with firmness and courage, his unsleeping vigilance and unbending resolution in the exercise of church discipline, were all deserving of the highest admiration. His very countenance, says Pontius, was at once venerable and full of grace, beyond what could well be expressed; so that no one could look upon him, without being inspired with a certain feeling of respectful awe. Cheerfulness and gravity were happily blended together in his looks; and his whole air and manner were such as to make it doubtful whether love or respect should preponderate in his presence; only this was certain, that he deserved the largest measure of both. His dress corresponded with the dignity and propriety of his appearance in other respects; it was simple, without being either ostentatious or mean. His liberality towards the poor, which had been so great before he became a bishop, formed afterwards also a leading ornament of his life. With his presbyters and people, he lived in relations of the tenderest sympathy and regard; dwelling among them as a father; taking counsel with them in all the concerns of the church; and seeking in every way especially to make them sharers of his own spirit, and full partners with himself in the heavenly calling of the gospel. He stood in the most intimate and active spiritual *rapproch* with

his flock; rejoicing with those that rejoiced and weeping with those that wept; making common cause with them in their trials; even bearing their sins in a certain sense and carrying their sicknesses and griefs, as though they had been his own. He could say of them literally in the strong language of Paul: "Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is offended and I burn not? We live, if ye stand fast in the Lord.—For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming? For ye are our glory and joy." He lived, not merely to rule and teach his people, but still more to make continual intercession for them before God. With prayers and tears they were borne upon his priestly heart, we may say, in the solemn ministrations of the altar, day and night.

It was not long till large and extraordinary occasion was afforded in the providence of God, for trying these virtues of the new bishop to the fullest extent. He had not enjoyed his dignity much more than a single year in peace, when the terrible Decian persecution, as it is called, burst like an avalanche upon the Church. The cruel edict reached Carthage about the beginning of the year 250. In such cases, the bishops, as being the acknowledged leaders of the Christian community, were always liable to become the first objects of attack. Cyprian however was especially obnoxious to the heathen party, as being so conspicuous a deserter from its ranks in the last part of his life, and now placed in the fore-front of the opposite cause.<sup>1</sup> The fanaticism of the mob, accordingly, at once fixed upon him for its prey. Circus amphitheatre and market, resounded with the cry: "*Cyprian to the lions!*" Not being found at once, he was proscribed, and all persons were forbidden to give him shelter or help. The rage of his enemies, however, was at this time disappointed. He saved himself by flight.

This was a momentous step in the circumstances, which was not taken without the most full and earnest deliberation. It was not a question of easy determination at once, to decide in view of all points between the two alternatives of flight or death. The crown of martyrdom was in many cases an object of ambition, in the early church; some were in danger of even rashly throwing themselves in its way; although the rule was not overlooked at the same time, by which our Saviour Himself

---

<sup>1</sup> In derision, and popular spite, they called him *Coprianus*, playing on the sense of a Greek word which signifies dung.



allowed his disciples, when persecuted in one city or country, to save themselves by fleeing to another. Cyprian had no difficulty in approving the course of others, who went into banishment, suffering the loss of their property, to avoid death. But his own case was not just of this general sort. He was the shepherd of the flock; and the question was mainly, what he owed in this fearful crisis to the welfare of his people. Would it not be the part of a hireling, to quit his post and forsake his charge, just when the wolf seemed ready to fall upon it and tear it in pieces? On the other hand, however, the presence of the bishop provoked persecution.\* And then what was to be gained for the flock itself, by allowing the shepherd to be smitten, and the sheep to be scattered abroad, by the very first blast of the storm which was now at hand? Was the church properly prepared to meet the hurricane in that way. Alas, Cyprian knew but too well, that this was not the case; and facts enough of a deplorable kind were soon offered to confirm his apprehension. His clergy wished him to retire, for the sake of the church. Still he seems to have hesitated for a time; being "in a strait betwixt two;" till in answer finally to his earnest prayers, he received what he considered a direct monition from heaven, ordering him to withdraw. So at least his own language in one place would seem to imply<sup>3</sup>; and the fact is asserted also by his biographer Pontius. In this way the question was conclusively settled; and with a few confidential attendants, he went into retirement some distance from Carthage, hiding himself at once from both the knowledge and the power of his enemies. But his pastoral relations to his flock were not dissolved by this absence. During the whole time of his recess, though absent in body, he was still with them in spirit; maintaining constant communication with them by messengers and letters; watching over their affairs with intense sympathy and concern; administering counsels, admonitions, instructions and exhortations, suited to their circumstances and

---

\* In his letter on the subject to the Roman presbyters and deacons (ep. 20, ed. Tauchn.) he says: "*Cum me clamore violento frequenter populus flagitasset, non tam meam salutem, quam quietem fratrum publicam cogitans interim secessi, ne per inverecundam praesentiam nostram seditio, quae coeperat, plus provocaretur.*"

<sup>3</sup> Ep. 16. ed. Tauchn. "*Audietis omnia, quando ad vos reducem me Dominus fecerit, qui ut secederem jussit.*" This might mean simply a scriptural or providential direction; but for one familiar with Cyprian's faith it refers more readily to a strictly supernatural order, by vision or in some other way.

wants; and above all assisting them continually by his intercessions and prayers.

The simple fact of this earnest pastoral supervision, thus firmly and steadily asserted on the one side and met with reciprocal confidence and trust on the other, through the entire period of his retreat, is enough of itself to shield him from the suspicion of having been actuated in the step, by the motive of mere fear or an unworthy regard in any way to the preservation of his own life. If there was any room for this reproach, says Neander, his subsequent behavior showed at least that he was able to overcome the dread of death, while the calm and candid tone with which he gives account of the course he took in his letter to the Roman clergy, must be considered enough for his justification. But no such doubtful apology does proper justice to the case. To admit the possibility of the weakness in question, is to overthrow the truth of the whole moral relation in which Cyprian is here exhibited to our view. A pious man might shrink from death, and choose flight as the more easy alternative for saving his faith; but he could not in these circumstances, without hypocrisy and guilt, assume a tone and air which would virtually imply the exact contrary of this, as we find Cyprian doing continually in his correspondence with the flock he had left behind him at Carthage. Nowhere does he betray the slightest sense of any such infirmity in what he had done, or the least anxiety to make his position right in the eyes of his own people. On the contrary, he uses towards them from first to last the tone of one, who felt that he had done nothing to forfeit their confidence, nothing to invalidate his pastoral right, nothing to embarrass the exercise of this right in the smallest degree. He places himself right in the midst of the bloody conflict which is going forward; makes common cause with the confessors and martyrs; acts throughout in the spirit of a general at the head of his troops; with trumpet tongue calls them to battle; triumphs in the "coronation" of such as were faithful unto death, as though it had been his own; weeps over the fall of the "lapsed," like a mother in bitterness for the loss of her children; insists afterwards on the discipline of the church, as the necessary remedy for such vast ruin; and at the risk of his own credit and popularity shows himself inexorable in asserting its most severe claims, in the face of a party violently bent on setting aside his authority, and supported to a certain extent by the voice even of confessors and martyrs themselves. Such deportment in such relations is not to be reconciled with the idea of a pusillanimous shrinking from martyrdom in the

allowed his disciples, when persecuted in one city or country, to save themselves by fleeing to another. Cyprian had no difficulty in approving the course of others, who went into banishment, suffering the loss of their property, to avoid death. But his own case was not just of this general sort. He was the shepherd of the flock; and the question was mainly, what he owed in this fearful crisis to the welfare of his people. Would it not be the part of a hireling, to quit his post and forsake his charge, just when the wolf seemed ready to fall upon it and tear it in pieces? On the other hand, however, the presence of the bishop provoked persecution.\* And then what was to be gained for the flock itself, by allowing the shepherd to be smitten, and the sheep to be scattered abroad, by the very first blast of the storm which was now at hand? Was the church properly prepared to meet the hurricane in that way. Alas, Cyprian knew but too well, that this was not the case; and facts enough of a deplorable kind were soon offered to confirm his apprehension. His clergy wished him to retire, for the sake of the church. Still he seems to have hesitated for a time; being "in a strait betwixt two;" till in answer finally to his earnest prayers, he received what he considered a direct monition from heaven, ordering him to withdraw. So at least his own language in one place would seem to imply<sup>2</sup>; and the fact is asserted also by his biographer Pontius. In this way the question was conclusively settled; and with a few confidential attendants, he went into retirement some distance from Carthage, hiding himself at once from both the knowledge and the power of his enemies. But his pastoral relations to his flock were not dissolved by this absence. During the whole time of his recess, though absent in body, he was still with them in spirit; maintaining constant communication with them by messengers and letters; watching over their affairs with intense sympathy and concern; administering counsels, admonitions, instructions and exhortations, suited to their circumstances and

---

\* In his letter on the subject to the Roman presbyters and deacons (ep. 20, ed. Tauchn.) he says: "*Cum me clamore violento frequenter populus flagitasset, non tam meam salutem, quam quietem fratrum publicam cogitans interim secessi, ne per inverecundam praesentiam nostram seditio, quae coeperat, plus provocaretur.*"

<sup>2</sup> Ep. 16. ed. Tauchn. "*Audietis omnia, quando ad vos reducem me Dominus fecerit, qui ut recederem iussit.*" This might mean simply a scriptural or providential direction; but for one familiar with Cyprian's faith it refers more readily to a strictly supernatural order, by vision or in some other way.

wants; and above all assisting them continually by his intercessions and prayers.

The simple fact of this earnest pastoral supervision, thus firmly and steadily asserted on the one side and met with reciprocal confidence and trust on the other, through the entire period of his retreat, is enough of itself to shield him from the suspicion of having been actuated in the step, by the motive of mere fear or an unworthy regard in any way to the preservation of his own life. If there was any room for this reproach, says Neander, his subsequent behavior showed at least that he was able to overcome the dread of death, while the calm and candid tone with which he gives account of the course he took in his letter to the Roman clergy, must be considered enough for his justification. But no such doubtful apology does proper justice to the case. To admit the possibility of the weakness in question, is to overthrow the truth of the whole moral relation in which Cyprian is here exhibited to our view. A pious man might shrink from death, and choose flight as the more easy alternative for saving his faith; but he could not in these circumstances, without hypocrisy and guilt, assume a tone and air which would virtually imply the exact contrary of this, as we find Cyprian doing continually in his correspondence with the flock he had left behind him at Carthage. Nowhere does he betray the slightest sense of any such infirmity in what he had done, or the least anxiety to make his position right in the eyes of his own people. On the contrary, he uses towards them from first to last the tone of one, who felt that he had done nothing to forfeit their confidence, nothing to invalidate his pastoral right, nothing to embarrass the exercise of this right in the smallest degree. He places himself right in the midst of the bloody conflict which is going forward; makes common cause with the confessors and martyrs; acts throughout in the spirit of a general at the head of his troops; with trumpet tongue calls them to battle; triumphs in the "coronation" of such as were faithful unto death, as though it had been his own; weeps over the fall of the "lapsed," like a mother in bitterness for the loss of her children; insists afterwards on the discipline of the church, as the necessary remedy for such vast ruin; and at the risk of his own credit and popularity shows himself inexorable in asserting its most severe claims, in the face of a party violently bent on setting aside his authority, and supported to a certain extent by the voice even of confessors and martyrs themselves. Such deportment in such relations is not to be reconciled with the idea of a pusillanimous shrinking from martyrdom in the

mind of Cyprian himself, without the supposition either of vast self-ignorance or else great conscious duplicity. He must have been in one way or the other totally undeserving of moral respect, if he could act the part he did in this style, without an inward consciousness fully answerable to what it implied. And then again, how could any such acted part have engaged the confidence of his people? Those who knew him best, gave him full credit practically for being all that this high bearing continually assumed. The entire relation between him and his church, as it comes out in his letters, is such as should silence at once every imagination of anything like pusillanimity in his conduct. Every such thought, even in the hypothetical and guarded form it carries with Neander, destroys in fact the true verisimilitude of the picture in view; reduces all to the play of mere human and worldly factors; caricatures the supernatural side of Christianity, and in the end, we may say, turns the divine itself into the diabolical. We might as well charge St. Paul with selfishness and affectation in his ministry, and yet pretend to honor him notwithstanding as a glorious representative and true apostle of Christ.

The wisdom and propriety of Cyprian's secession were abundantly shown, in the salutary fruit which grew out of it for the church, both while it lasted and after it was over. Though outwardly absent, he was still the soul of the Christian cause at Carthage, throughout the entire ordeal of the Decian persecution. The faithful were encouraged and animated, by the assurance that he was still at their head and ready to die with them in the end for their common faith. Martyrs and confessors fought their good fight more joyfully, from knowing that his eye was upon them, and his heart with them, in the deadly struggle. When peace returned, there was no one so well fitted to restore the disorders, and repair the breaches, which had been caused by the overflowing scourge. Not only his own diocese, but the church at large, derived the greatest advantage while he lived from his truly apostolical vigilance and zeal; while his writings have proved a large source of instruction and benefit to the whole Christian world, through all ages since.

It has been intimated already, that the church was not properly prepared for the fearful trial which came upon her under the Emperor Decius. A comparatively long season of outward prosperity and rest previously had led as usual to much worldliness and carnal security in her communion. Multitudes professing the Christian name, and not a few even who served at

the altar, had come to be perfectly secular in their character, differing but little either in spirit or life from the Pagan world with which they were surrounded. It is a gloomy picture Cyprian himself draws of this dismal fact, in the first part of his tract *De Lapsis*; a picture, which for the honor of Christianity one might wish to keep out of view; but which, for the right understanding of Christianity at the same time, it is very important in truth that we should be brought to look steadily in the face. In the end, the actual here forms a better commentary on the mystery of godliness, the proper nature of the church in the world, than any ideal that may be substituted for it by the human imagination. The persecution, says Cyprian, was an exploration, mercifully ordained by God to revive discipline and restore faith. Both had fallen into sad decay. "Many, unmindful of what believers had been in the age of the apostles and should be always, had given themselves up to the pursuit of wealth, and were bent only on increasing their worldly estate. Devotion was wanting among the priests, and faith among the deacons; there was no charity in men's works, no strictness in their manners. Men dressed their beards; women painted their persons; both eyes and hair, God's work, were falsified by art into a new form. Cunning deceptions were practised on the simple, and advantage taken of brethren by dishonest tricks. Marriages were formed with unbelievers, by which Christ's members were prostituted to the Gentiles. Oaths were taken not only rashly, but falsely; those in authority were treated with proud insolence; curses flowed from poisoned lips; discords were kept up with lasting mutual hatred. Many bishops even, who should have been a lesson and example to others, renouncing the service of God for the care of worldly things, forsook their sees, and left their people, wandering into other parts of the country in quest of markets for profitable trade, anxious to have money largely while brethren in the church were in extreme want, grasping farms by trading and fraud, and multiplying their gains by interest."

This, be it remembered, in the third century, and before the Church had come to enjoy any toleration by law in the Roman empire. The picture of course sets before us a part only of the Christianity to which it refers; there was embraced in this a large amount besides of very different character. Still there is reason to believe, that this bad side of the case reached very far, and that there was an amount of worldliness and ungodliness in the church far beyond what is commonly imagined of these primitive times. And yet all this was strangely joined, as we

shall see, with the proper superhuman power of faith, and a corresponding presence of true supernatural grace, in the same church, to an extent which was found fully sufficient to carry it triumphantly through the fires of persecution, and to give it soon after the mastery of the Roman world.

The first effects of the Decian trial were terribly disastrous. A large portion of the Christian profession was at once swept away by it, like chaff before the wind. The imperial order required all to conform to the religion of the state, by taking part in some idolatrous ceremony, prescribed by the magistrate in the way of test. In the first place there was a proclamation merely, calling upon all persons to come forward within a certain time, and prove themselves good subjects of the government in this easy way. Only those who refused to do so, exposed themselves afterwards to more active persecution. They might quit the country before the term was up. In that case, their property was confiscated, and they were forbidden to return on pain of death; but they saved their faith. Such as chose not to fly, saw themselves at the mercy of the populace and the civil power, and in danger always of being called to the most severe account. They might be cited at any time to answer for their faith; when if they refused to deny Christ, by doing homage to idols, they were cast into prison, and subjected to sharp torture from time to time for the purpose of overcoming their resolution. Those who stood this trial were honored in the church as *confessors*. In the case of some, the process was carried sooner or later to the issue of a violent death. They were then known and revered as *martyrs*. To the disgrace however of a large number calling themselves Christians at this time in Carthage, they did not even wait till such confession and suffering were required at their hands, as the price of their fidelity to the Saviour; but showed themselves eager rather, on the first noise of the coming danger, to place themselves beyond its reach, and to save both life and property, by submitting of their own accord to the idolatrous test through which this bad security was to be gained. "At the first word of the threatening foe," Cyprian writes, "a very large portion of the brotherhood (*maximus fratum numerus*) betrayed their faith, prostrated not by the violence of persecution, but by their own voluntary fall." All admonitions and engagements, the hopes of heaven and the terrors of hell, seemed to be at once forgotten. "They did not wait to go up to the Capitol at least by compulsion, to deny on interrogation. Many conquered before the battle, overthrown without conflict, retained not even this credit, that they seemed



to sacrifice to idols unwillingly. They ran to the forum of their own accord, hastened to death freely, as though they had before wished this, and but embraced now an opportunity which they had always desired. How many were put off by the magistrates through the close of day; how many even begged that their own ruin might not be thus postponed!" More than this. "For many their own destruction was not enough; they urged one another with mutual exhortations to perdition, pledged one another reciprocally in bumpers of death. And that nothing might be wanting to the fulness of crime, children also, carried or led by the hand of their parents, lost what they had acquired in the beginning of their life."

The great body of the "lapsed" probably were of this sort. Others however fell with less inexcusable disgrace; yielding only when they were brought to trial; or it may be not till nature was well nigh worn out by long privations and horrible torments. Some allowed themselves to take a sort of middle course, which amounted, in fact however to the sin they endeavored in this way to avoid. They did not themselves actually sacrifice; but by paying a fee they procured certificates, declaring that they had complied with the edict; or it might be, without this, and even without personally appearing before the magistrate, had their names enrolled simply on the official list of those who were thus approved. It was easy to frame a plausible apology for these evasions, especially under this latter form; but they were condemned by the church as tacit treason to the cause of Christ.

Altogether the fall of so large a portion of his flock was a calamity, that filled the soul of Cyprian with keen mortification and distress. It is to him as though the raging foe had torn away from the church a part of her own bowels. "What shall I do here, beloved brethren?" we hear him pathetically say. "In such tumultuating inward commotion, what or how shall I speak? It needs tears rather than words, to express the grief with which the wound of our body is to be bewailed, the manifold loss of our once numerous community to be deplored. For who can be so hard and iron hearted, who so unmindful of fraternal charity, as to be able to stand in the midst of such vast wreck, such dismal and equalid ruins, with dry eyes, and not at once be forced rather to burst into tears, weeping forth his sorrow before it can be spoken? I mourn, brethren, I mourn together with you; nor is personal soundness and private health enough, in my case, to assuage my griefs; since the pastor is most wounded in the wound of his flock. I join my bosom

severally with all, I share their various loads of desolation and grief. I wail with those that wail, and weep with those that weep, and feel myself fallen with those that fall. Those darts of the raging enemy have pierced at the same time my members, those cruel swords have entered my bowels. My mind has no exemption or freedom from the pressure of the persecution; I too am prostrated, by affection, in the prostration of my brethren."

We might be ready to suppose, that where it cost so little to fall there would be little or no care afterwards to come to terms with the church, and that the fall would easily prove thus for many a total and final apostacy. This however was not the case. The lapsed generally, it would seem, did not mean this, or at least were not able to carry things out to this extremity. Their compliance with idolatry was an expedient merely for avoiding persecution. They still believed Christianity to be true, and saw in the church the only ark of salvation for a ruined world. No sooner were they free from secular danger, accordingly, by means of their defection, than they began to show an anxiety, many of them at least, to be restored again to the state from which they had fallen. The reconciliation of the lapsed, their return into the bosom of the church, became thus a difficult and embarrassing question, before the persecution itself which gave rise to it had come to an end.

Deplorable as the defection seemed however, it was by no means a defeat of the Christian cause. While some fell, others stood. The true life and vigor of the church came more conspicuously into view, by contrast with such partial desolation; and were found amply sufficient to sustain, and in the end to turn back, the full weight of the shock with which they were now tried. Many witnessed a good confession before the magistrate, and went joyfully into prison for the name of Christ; many went into voluntary exile, forsaking their property to save their lives with their faith; while a large number besides, who were not called upon to do so, showed themselves willing to face persecution for the same cause, if it were necessary, by simply refusing to do what was required by the government. The honor of the confessors was still farther advanced by the sharp tortures, that were employed without effect to subdue their constancy; and in the case of a number it came to its full consummation in martyrdom. To this whole army of the faithful Cyprian refers (*De Lapsis*, §. 2. 3.), in tones of almost rapturous exultation. Speaking of the joy with which he looked forward to his meeting with the confessors, on his return from ex-

ile, he exclaims: "Lo! the white robed cohort of Christ's soldiers, who have broken with firm front the impetuous shock of urgent persecution, prepared to suffer imprisonment, armed to endure death! Bravely ye have withstood the world, a glorious spectacle to God, an example for brethren to follow. The religious tongue owned Christ, in whom it had before professed to believe; the illustrious hands, which had been used only to divine works, refused now sacrilegious sacrifices; mouths sanctified by celestial food, after the body and blood of the Lord rejected the contamination of meat offered to idols; from the impious and wicked veil, with which the captive heads of the sacrificers were there bound, your heads remained free; the forehead made pure by God's sign could not brook the Devil's crown, but reserved itself for the crown of the Lord. With what delight does the church, as a mother, receive you to her bosom returning from battle! With what sense of blessedness and joy she throws open her gates, that you may enter, in serried ranks, bearing back trophies from the prostrate foe! Along with triumphing men come women also, who in this warfare with the world have conquered at the same time the weakness of their own sex. There too are virgins, in service now doubly glorious, and boys superior in virtue to their years. Nor is the multitude around you without part in this triumph, following close in the footsteps of your own conspicuous praise. In them is found also the same sincerity of heart, the same firm integrity of faith. Rooted immovably in the heavenly precepts, and established in the evangelical traditions, they were not dismayed by the prospect of banishment, torture, loss of property, or loss of life. A term was set for the trial of faith. But he who remembers that he has renounced this world, regards no day of the world; nor does he now calculate times on earth, who looks for eternity from God. Let no one, beloved brethren, detract from this glory, or disparage the credit of those who have thus kept the faith by invidious remark. When the term set for renouncing was up, every one who had not renounced, in fact proclaimed himself a Christian. The first title of victory, is to have confessed the Lord when apprehended by the hands of the Gentiles. A second degree of glory, is to be reserved to the Lord by a cautious retreat. The first is a public confession, the second private; that conquers the secular magistrate, this is content to keep a pure conscience before God who sees the heart."

In another place (Ep. 10.), he gives us a glimpse of the severe character of the ordeal, through which these heroes and heroines of the cross were required to pass. He is writing to

VOL. IV.—NO. III. 18\*

the martyrs and confessors themselves, yet in prison. "I exult and rejoice, O most brave and blessed brethren, to hear of your faith and courage, in which our mother the church glories. She gloried not long since indeed, when the constancy of those who confessed Christ led them to accept voluntary banishment for his name. This present confession however, as it excels in suffering, is in proportion more illustrious in honor. With the thickening of the fight, the glory of the soldiers has also increased. Nor were ye deterred from the battle through fear of torments, but these served rather to provoke your zeal, so that ye returned still courageously to the terrible contest with unflinching devotion. Some of your number, I learn, are already crowned; some the next thing to the same victorious coronation; while all, whose glorious company fills the prison, are animated with similar and equal ardent resolution for carrying on the contest; as becomes soldiers in the divine camp of Christ, whose firm faith no blandishments should deceive, no threats terrify, no pains and tortures overcome, since greater is he who is in us than he who is in this world, and no earthly punishment can be so mighty to cast down as the divine protection is to raise and uphold. Proof of this has been had in the glorious engagement of our brethren, who leading the way to others in overcoming torments have confronted the battle with an example of courage and faith, till the battle itself has been conquered and forced to yield. With what praises shall I proclaim your merit, most brave brethren? How sufficiently extol the strength of your resolution, the perseverance of your faith? Ye bore to the completion of glory the most excruciating torture, and yielded not to punishments which might be said rather to yield at last to you. Crowns brought pains to an end, which torments failed to reach. Torture was increased and protracted, not so as to break down the constancy of faith, but only to bear the men of God more speedily to the Lord. The admiring crowd of witnesses, saw the celestial conflict, the conflict of God, the spiritual contest, the battle of Christ, where his servants stood with free voice, with uncorrupted mind, with divine courage, naked indeed of secular armor, but equipped as believers in the arms of faith. The tortured stood stronger than their tormentors, and beaten and torn limbs vanquished those who beat and tore. Faith showed itself insuperable to the long sustained fury of the assault, even when at last, the body a broken wreck, it was not limbs now so much as wounds that were tortured in the servants of God. Blood flowed that might extinguish the conflagration of persecution, that might quench with glorious gore

the flames and fires of hell. O what a sight was that to the Lord, how sublime; how great, how acceptable in God's eyes through the consecrated faithfulness of his soldiery; as it is written in the Psalms, the Holy Ghost addressing and admonishing us also in like words: *Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.* Precious truly is that death, which buys immortality with the price of its blood, which wins a crown by the completion of virtue."

The man who could write in this style was actuated certainly by no selfish worldly consideration, in holding himself personally aloof from the scene of conflict whose triumphs he describes in such glowing terms. We are bound to believe him, when he declares (Ep. 7.) his anxiety to be back among his suffering people, and represents himself as engaged by a sense of duty only to delay his return. His whole soul was with his flock. He makes the cause of the martyrs and confessors his own, and seems to share with them the glory of their testimony for Christ. It is a subject for congratulation only that one and another, from time to time, are brought to seal this testimony with death. Let those who are still left behind in prison, be ambitious only of the same illustrious coronation. "If the hour of conflict calls, face it boldly, fight bravely, knowing that ye fight under the eyes of your present Lord, and by the confession of his name are advancing to his own glory; who moreover is no mere spectator of his contending servants, but also wrestles and contends in us, and while he crowns is at the same time crowned himself in the issue of our combat." Such martyrdom, and such readiness for martyrdom, are regarded as the highest ornament of the cause to which they belong. "O blessed church ours, to be so irradiated with the rays of divine favor, to be made so illustrious by the glorious blood of martyrs in our own days. It was white before by the good works of the brethren; now it has become purple through martyr's blood. Its garlands lack neither lilies nor roses. Let all strive now for the ample dignity of either distinction; let them lay hold of crowns, either white by work or purple by suffering. In the heavenly camp both peace and war have their own flowers, to crown the glory of the Christian soldier."

While he magnifies in this way the honor of the martyrs, he is by no means unmindful of their wants while still in the body. The presbyters and deacons are urged to keep a continual eye on the necessities, both of those who were thrown into prison, and of others also who in their poverty continued faithful to Christ. The funds of the church must be steadily applied to

their relief. For this the clergy held such money in their hands. His own portion of course was not to be spared. "I beg of you," he writes in one place (Ep. 7.), "to have good care of the widows, of infirm persons, and of all the poor. Also let strangers, if any are in need, be helped out of my own amount placed in charge of our colleague Regatianus; to whom, lest this may possibly be already all laid out, I now send also by the acolyth Naricus another sum, that cases of distress may be the more readily and largely helped." Due regard must be had still more to spiritual wants. The confessors are urged to give themselves to heavenly meditations and prayers. By the daily sacrifice of the altar especially, they must arm themselves for the great conflict. The priests must visit them in turns, one at a time with his assisting deacon, to "offer" in their behalf; going thus singly and alternately to avoid exciting attention; for which reason also the brethren generally must not go to see them in crowds; lest it should rouse jealousy, and lead to a denial of access to them altogether. "Would that my situation and office," he exclaims in one of his letters (Ep. 12), "allowed me to be now present. Most readily and cheerfully would I fulfil, with solemn ministry, all the duties of love towards our most brave brethren. But let your diligence be a substitute for my care, and do all that should be done for those, who are distinguished through the divine favor by such merits of faith and virtue. Let the bodies also of any, who though not put to the torture in prison yet depart this life there by a glorious end, receive attention and affectionate care. For neither courage nor honor are wanting in their case, to place them on the roll of the blessed martyrs. For themselves, they have suffered all that they showed themselves ready and willing to suffer.— They have endured, faithful, and firm, and unconquerable, even unto death. Where to will and confession in prison and bonds is added the term of dying, the martyr's glory is complete. Finally take note also of the days on which they depart, that we may be able to celebrate their commemoration among the memories of the martyrs. Although Tertullus, our most faithful and devoted brother, who with his other care shown toward the brethren in every active service is not wanting in attention to this object also, will continue to inform me of the days on which our blessed brethren in prison pass into immortality by the end of a glorious death, that we may celebrate oblations and sacrifices here for their commemoration; which we hope soon to celebrate with you also, by the protection of the Lord."

The style in which Cyprian addresses these sufferers for the

name of Christ, it has sometimes been remarked, is not just according to modern evangelical rule. There is often what we can hardly help feeling to be an undue glorification, not only of the martyrs already dead, but of those also who were steadfastly aspiring after the same crown. It seems to be taken too easily for granted, that this crown formed as a matter of course a direct passport to the abodes of bliss. The grand point is made to be simply enduring to the end. We hear no warnings on the danger of self-deception, no calls to anxious self-examination. The subjective side of the Christian salvation is most completely merged in the objective. Then there is a strange want of caution or reserve, in speaking of personal merit. Secular soldiers could hardly be stimulated more directly, by the idea of high desert, or by the prospect of glory and renown. And yet it would be a great mistake, to suppose that this implied no sense of the need of humility and vigilant diligence on the part of these confessors, no apprehension of the spiritual dangers to which they were still exposed. Cyprian in fact often refers to this. He felt that the merit of a good confession, and the praises bestowed upon it, might become a snare; and he abounds in exhortations accordingly, enforcing the necessity of a subsequently pious walk and conversation to make such credit full and complete. We learn from him too, that there was but too much in the actual course of events to justify such anxious solicitude. Some few of the confessors at least fell into gross irregularities and sins. "I hear that some disgrace your number," he writes *Ep.* 13, "and destroy the praise of your excellent name by their corrupt conduct; whom ye yourselves, as lovers and defenders of your own renown, are bound to rebuke, restrain, and correct. What reproach is it to your name, when one lives only to become intemperate or lascivious; another returns into the world, from which he had been expatriated, to be apprehended and punished afterwards, not now as a Christian, but as a malefactor! I hear too that some are inflated and proud." It is a strange glimpse we have in this way, into the interior life of the church in these ancient times. There is much in it, which it is not easy at once to understand, but from which, rightly considered, there may be for this very reason a great deal also to learn.

The object of this sketch is, not merely to give some account of Cyprian, but to illustrate at the same time, from the mirror of his life and writings, the Christianity of the third century. The subject will be resumed hereafter.

J. W. N.



## STEPHEN, THE FIRST MARTYR.

ALTHOUGH the doctrine of the resurrection and the strict morality of Christians had first excited the hostility of the Sadducees; yet it was quite natural that in the course of time the opposition of Christianity to the hypocritical self-righteousness of the Pharisees, and to their bondage to the dead letter of the Scriptures, should also come to view. The result was brought about by Stephen, one of the seven deacons of the Church of Jerusalem who was distinguished for his wisdom and power to work miracles. He was in all probability a Hellenist, in other words, of Graceo-Jewish origin: an opinion that may be inferred from the complaint of the foreign Jewish converts that their widows were neglected in the daily ministration—the occasion that gave rise to the appointment of deacons—as well as from his Greek name and his more liberal views of the Gospel. He was the first to set forth decidedly and forcibly the inconsistency of Christianity with lifeless Judaism, and, in this respect, became the forerunner of the Apostle Paul, who sprang from the martyr's blood. Here lies his significance. On the formation of his views special influence seems to have been exerted by the sermons of Christ against the Pharisees (Matt. 23); and by His threatening prophecies concerning the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, (Matt. 24: 1 et seq. 21: 18, Luke. 17: 22 et seq.) Stephen held many controversies with foreign Jews who had received their education in Greece, and, it is likely too with Saul of Tarsus\* (Acts 6: 9), and none were able "to resist the wisdom and the spirit with which he spake." No doubt he attempted to convince them, reasoning from the Old Testament, that Jesus was the Messiah and founder of a new spiritual order of divine worship, and that, in consequence of its rejection of salvation, the Jewish nation was approaching destruction. Thus he provoked the charge of blaspheming Moses, which was regarded as tantamount to blaspheming God. Men were suborned who appeared before the Sanhedrim and alleged that he had said: Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered unto

---

\*To be inferred from the special interest taken by Paul in the persecution of Stephen, (7: 58, 8: 1;) and from the fact that, among those foreign Jews who disputed with Stephen in the Synagogues, those from Cilicia, Paul's native country, are mentioned expressly (6: 9).

us.\* What gave occasion to this charge against Stephen, was probably his opposition to the Pharisees, over-valuation of the temple and the ceremonial law, as well as his reference to the abrogation of the existing economy of salvation: a fact that he could learn from the prophetic language of Christ respecting the destroying and building again of the temple, and the cessation of all worship limited to a particular nation or to particular places, whether Gerizim or Jerusalem. But the charge of his enemies, that for this reason he blasphemed Moses and God, was a slander. For the whole of the old dispensation looks beyond itself to Christianity, as the complete fulfilment of the law and the prophets.

The address of this bold witness for the truth, delivered under the inspiration of the moment<sup>a</sup> in vindication of himself before the Sanhedrim, (Acts 7: 2-53)—his angel-like countenance the while beaming with heavenly peace and serenity (ch. 6: 15)—is not indeed a direct but an indirect refutation, possessing superior excellence, of the charge alledged against him. In the true spirit of Christ disregarding all consequences, and, carried away by his holy zeal for the things of God, he lost sight of all that might conciliate his judges. Yet his vindication of the divine economy of salvation, enabled every reflecting hearer to make an application for himself to the case in hand. By far the larger portion of the address (v. 2-50) is a review of the history of the Israelites from the calling of Abraham to the giving of the law by Moses, and from this period to the building of the temple by Solomon. In reference to it he quoted a passage from Isaiah (66: 1) against the carnal superstition of the Jews, who imagined that the Most High could be limited to a building reared by the hands of men. Stephen designed not only to evince his belief in the Old Testament by taking this retrospect of sacred history, but chiefly to demonstrate the fearful manner in which the Jews had abused the grace of God. The greater His favors had been the more stubbornness and in-

---

\* (Acts 6: 11-14.) A complaint, very similar to this, was brought against Christ (Matt. 26: 61): "This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days:" a perversion of his language, (John 2: 19) which refers immediately to the temple of his body, but indirectly to the natural consequences of his death and resurrection, namely, the destruction of the holy sanctuary belonging to the old dispensation, and the introduction of the new christian mode of worship.

<sup>a</sup> A fact that may explain some unimportant historical discrepancies that appear in his address. However, these serve only to confirm the credibility of the narrative. Comp. Com. on Acts 7: 6, 7, 16, 53.

gratitude had they manifested towards Him and His ambassador, particularly towards Moses. The past he held up to the view of his accusers in which, as in a mirror, he wished them to recognize the manner in which they themselves had treated the Messiah and His followers\*. At the same time, from a particular point of observation, he represents the dealings of God as constituting a theocratic plan that, ever looking beyond itself, becomes complete finally in Christ. Moses already spake of a Prophet that should come after him; the temple of Solomon, constructed by hands of men, was but the type of another—of the worship of God in spirit and in truth. It is probable that he intended also to proceed to the third period of sacred history—to review the Messianic predictions and the conflict of the Prophets with the carnal disposition of the Jews; and more minutely to describe their attachment to externals, their ingratitude and obstinacy; but his hearers, feeling keenly the point in his recapitulation of their past history, were moved to indignation and interrupted him. He passed over, therefore, from the calmness of recital to the pathos of an earnest sermon on repentance and

---

\* John Jacob Hess, in his "*Gesch. und Schriften der Apostel Jesu*," 2d ed. vol. I p. 78 et seq. Zurich, 1778, directs special attention to the fact that this resemblance was in the mind of Stephen, particularly, when he dwelt on the History of Moses. A part of the address sounds almost as if Stephen were relating the life of Christ with but a change of names. "The whole" says he p. 83 "is a picture of the Jews' treatment of Christ. Their manner of thinking as it came to view in the life of Christ, is set forth before their eyes in their past history, as in a mirror. The jealousy of Joseph's brethren, the treatment of Moses both prior and subsequent to his flight into Midian, and the conduct of the Israelites under the dealings of God with them in the wilderness, are designed to represent to Stephen's hearers, their own character and disposition." This work of the Rev. Superintendent of Zurich, as also his "*Lebensgeschichte Jesu*," the more recent works on the same subject seem to have passed by almost without any notice. But it still merits particular regard. Its truly pious spirit and sound investigation should put many of our modern critics who look upon it with contempt, to the blush. "The history of the Jews" he remarks very beautifully in his preface "more especially that of the Evangelists and Apostles, constitutes for me an ever new, an inexhaustible treasury of wisdom and love, my knowledge of which, defective indeed yet always increasing, brightens the days of my life and gladdens my prospects for the future. And I know that any one who will but read with a sincere love of truth, cannot fail to be both convinced and comforted; for the lineaments of the divine character of these discourses, deeds and events are so distinct, even when they are examined by themselves, and much more so when they are considered in their connection with each other, that I can not believe that there is any work of God in Heaven or on earth, which bears upon it more striking marks of a divine origin."

concluded in the terrible language of condemnation, recorded in verse 51-53. Holding up before the consciences of his accusers and judges—those true sons of the murderers of the Prophets—the betrayal and crucifixion of the innocent and righteous Messiah as the culminating point of their ingratitude and rebellion, he flung back the charge of impiety which they had made against him.

Thus, indeed, all possibility of acquittal was precluded; he was not, however, concerned for his life, but only for the defence of the truth. The members of the Sanhedrim gnashed their teeth upon him in rage; but Stephen, looking steadfastly into Heaven, saw Jesus, the glorified Son of Man, standing <sup>4</sup> on the right hand of God Almighty, ready to protect him and to receive him into glory, and able in the majesty of his authority and might to put all the machinations of his enemies to shame. No longer could these zealots listen to him. Without a regular trial or condemnation or any authority from the Governor—that is in violation of all civil order, for the Romans had abolished the authority of the Sanhedrim over life and death—they cast him out of the city and stoned him to death.<sup>5</sup> According to custom among the Jews the witnesses, in order to evince their conviction of his guilt, cast the first stones; and not to be encumbered by their flowing garments they laid them at the feet

---

<sup>4</sup> As Christ is generally represented as sitting at the right hand of God, the word "standing" (*stans* Acts 7: 55, 56.) is remarkable; and is explained by the fact, that the Lord appears to protect and deliver Stephen from the rage of his enemies: a view which was already properly understood by Gregory the Great, who says; *Sedere judicantis (et imperantis) est, stare vero pugnantis vel adjuvantis. Stephanus stantem vidit quem adiutorem habuit.* (Homil. 19, in fest. Ascens.) This unusual expression as well as the phrase "Son of man," which occurs no where else in the writings of the Apostle as a designation of Jesus Christ, is another evidence of the authenticity of the narrative. If, as Dr. Bauer maintains, the address were invented and put into the mouth of Stephen by the author of Acts, a more direct and marked effort would doubtless have been made to conceal the fact,

<sup>5</sup> Hence many commentators maintain that his martyrdom took place soon after the recall of Pilate A. D. 36, and prior to the arrival of the Procurator Marcellus. During the interval such disorders could more easily have occurred with impunity. The lawless proceeding may be explained however without this hypothesis. Fanatical Jews cherished but little respect for the laws of the despised Romans, and in the hour of excitement could easily forget the possible consequences of violating them; or they may have supposed these consequences could be evaded, in as much as the sentence of death had not been pronounced formally, and the execution therefore was not official in its character.

of a young man, named Saul; from which circumstance we may infer that he took a very active part in the execution of this supposed blasphemer and regarded his conduct as an acceptable service to God. But Stephen committed his soul to Jesus, as Jesus when dying on the cross had committed himself to his Father, (Luke 23: 46); then, bowing his knees, and whilst the rage of his enemies was spending itself upon his person, he prayed—imitating also in this respect the example of his Master (Comp. Luke 23: 34)—that God would not lay this sin to the charge of his murderers, and fell asleep.

Worthily does this man of God take the lead in the glorious company of martyrs, whose blood from this time forth should continue to enrich the soil of the Church. Even in the last moments of his life he reflects the image of his dying Redeemer. The principle for which he died, namely, the free evangelical conception of Christianity in opposition to narrow, formal Judaism, lived on after him and was more fully developed by Paul the Apostle to the Gentiles: one who at the time was among his most violent opposers. His death served also to extend the limits of the Church: it was the signal for a general persecution and dispersion of believers in Jesus, none remaining in Jerusalem but the Apostles who, in the spirit of true heroism regarded it as their duty to face every danger. Thus the storm of persecution bore the Gospel-brands into different parts of Palestine, as far even as Phenicia, Syria and Cyprus. (Acts 8: 1, 4; 11: 19, 20.)

*Translated from Dr. Schaff's Kirchenfreund by*  
*Tiffin, Ohio.*

E. V. G.

## DR. BERG'S LAST WORDS.

JEHOVAH-NISSI. EXODUS, xvii : 15. *Farewell Words to the First German Reformed Church, Race Street, Philadelphia. Delivered March 14, 1852.* By JOSEPH F. BERG, D. D. Philadelphia : Lippincott, Grambo & Co.

It is generally known that the Rev. Dr. Berg, who has long been ambitious to head a party and create trouble in the German Reformed Church, by birth a Moravian, by education an American Puritan of the most thorough anti-popery stamp, has seen fit recently to do what he ought to have done long ago, abandon the denomination in which he has found himself so poorly at home for the purpose of trying his fortune in another. Pains have been taken to make the event notorious. It was evidently expected to create a sensation ; and this valedictory discourse forms part of the apparatus, or what we may call stage thunder, which has been ingeniously contrived in aid of such end.

The sensation has not indeed come to much. The stage thunder has proved to be very weak. The *mountain* in labor has once more given birth to a ridiculous mouse. This sermon in particular is intrinsically a small affair. Still it merits attention. It is not *beneath* notice, like too much from the pen of the same author in the Protestant Quarterly, by its gross vulgarity and rant. There is some decency in its style, some dignity in its tone. And then it has significance by its relations and accidents ; as the end historically of much that has gone before ; as a curious exemplification theologically of the intellectual obliquity and wrong spirit of the whole religious tendency, which it may be said in some sense to represent. Altogether, we say, the sermon is not undeserving of regard.

It may be styled in general an apology for leaving the German Reformed Church. This in itself is no very serious or terrible event. To pass from one denomination to another, as the Protestant world now stands, is by no means an uncommon thing ; and where the denominations are related to each other, as in the case of the German Reformed church and the Reformed Dutch, as different branches merely of the same historical confession, it is felt that transition from one to the other may very properly be regarded as a matter of mere expediency, which calls in no case for any anxious apology or account. If Dr. Berg found his situation unpleasant, had got into difficulty with any part of his congregation, or felt it desirable for any reason

to change his ecclesiastical relations, he had it in his power to do so with as much facility, and as little noise, as to change his residence from Green Hill to New Jersey. The old Stoic maxim, "If the house smokes leave it," though a very bad one for its own purpose, an excuse for suicide, is of full force for our reigning Protestant church life at the present time. There is no *necessity* in our sticking to any communion. We may at pleasure seek another, and be just as much in the church general when the change is made as we supposed ourselves to be before. Such is the privilege, shall we call it, or the plague, of our glorious sect system. Changing churches is just as small a thing with us as changing sides in politics, or mounting a first pair of spectacles. For such a man as Dr. Berg however, the author of the "Old Paths," the would-be slayer of Goliath Hughes, the redoubtable coadjutor of the Sparrys, Leaheys, Giustinianis, et id genus omne, in their bellowing war upon the Pope—no such every day triviality in an affair of this sort would answer. He must play Hannibal or Napoleon. No merely congregational reason for resigning his charge was enough. It must be a denominational affair. He leaves his dear people, if we are to take his own word for it, not because either he or they had grown tired at all of his pastoral relation in itself considered, but purely and wholly on account of what he proclaims to be the false theological position of the German Reformed body as a whole. If any other considerations have had weight with him, they are at least completely overshadowed by this. Here he plants his grand plea, before the tribunal of the world. He joins issue, not with the Race Street congregation as such in any way, but with the Synod of the German Reformed church. His going out of the body is to be no vulgar transition simply from one sect to another. It must be a solemn *exodus*; a sort of miniature repetition of the scene which took place, when the Free Church of Scotland went forth from the Establishment with the great Dr. Chalmers at its head. It must be for conscience sake. It must carry with it the air of a great and heroic sacrifice for the cause of truth and righteousness. Dr. Berg goes out as a "witness for the truth;" a glorious *seceder* in his own eyes; another Wesley or Erskine; nay a sort of second Luther, (or if that title still hold good to the immortal Ronge, say then at all events, a *third* Luther,) with special call and mission, if it were necessary, to found even a new church. Happily there has been no need for that. He finds a home for the present in another denomination. But his plea covers the right of secession, in its widest extent. We almost wonder, he



was not led to set up a fresh sect, to try at least the experiment of a schism in the German Reformed Church, to be baptized with his own name. But, "*non omnia possumus omnes*." A captaincy in such case, without even a corporal's guard to follow, is rather a sorry business. Though there might be "more than seven thousand, who had not bowed the knee to Baal, or kissed his images," it was either hard to find them, or they showed no great mind to go dancing a hornpipe after any such mock Elias. It was wise then not to venture a new church, but to take refuge rather in the "old Church of Holland, the Gibraltar of Protestantism," already well known and firmly established. Still the movement must not forfeit, for this reason, the character of a true secession, a veritable heroism for faith, in the eyes of an admiring world. It is pleasant to be a martyr, or at any rate to have the name of one, if it come not to *bona fide* blood, and cost nothing either to stomach or to purse. The object then of this valedictory is to make good a title to such luxury and praise. It is a song, with the ever recurring burden and refrain: "Come, see my zeal for the Lord!" The apology is at the same time a wholesale assault. It is an effort, on the part of the Rev. Dr. Berg, to fix on the German Reformed Church the character of hopeless, well nigh universal, heresy and apostacy, for the purpose of converting into a grand crisis, and surrounding with eclat, the step by which he has now passed beyond its bosom.

But how now is it attempted to establish and sustain this monstrously latitudinous, this exceedingly grave and most solemnly responsible charge? By a process, which has no full parallel probably in the whole history of protesting and witnessing Secederdom. No direct action of the Church itself is brought into question. No plea is filed of oppression or wrong endured at her hands. The universal issue is at once shifted over into the form of a controversy with her theological professors, on whom an effort is made to fasten sundry supposed errors, the blame of which is then held to fall back in some way on the body to which they belong. In looking up these supposed errors, the plaintiff has allowed himself the widest range, going back for them mostly to past years, and gathering them in a loose way from all points of the compass, with almost no regard whatever to order or truth; the object being simply, as it would seem, to get up an imposing show of heads and topics for popular effect. Let us look briefly, in the first place, on these heads of accusation in themselves considered. We shall then be the better prepared, to form a proper judgment of the use to which

they are violently turned by Dr. Berg in his crusade against the German Reformed Church.

I. First we have the vexed topic again of tradition and private judgment. Our suffering martyr sets himself forward as the champion of the Bible, as the only rule of faith and duty, and indirectly charges those whom he opposes with denying this fundamental principle of the Reformation. He moves here however in no small fog; through some concern apparently of seeming himself to make too little of church creeds and symbols, and particularly of the authority of the Heidelberg Catechism, which he professes to hold still in most dutiful regard; though it turns out to be in the end only as he regards a good index to a book, whose errors and mistakes he feels at perfect liberty to correct afterwards by his own reading. His theory runs out thus into the most bald scheme of individual opinion, by which every man is to be his own theologian, and to manufacture his creed for himself. "Denunciations of the right of private judgment," he tells us, "are all unscriptural;" a proposition which plainly means as he uses it, if it have any meaning at all, that the private judgment of every body, be his religious standpoint what it may, forms the ultimate tribunal, the last resort, to which all questions concerning the sense of the Bible are to be carried, before which they are to be tried, and by which they are to be settled, without liberty of appeal. Now the simple statement of this proposition, in its own proper terms, is enough to show its absurdity. It must be shrouded in fog, to be saved from universal derision. No sect acts on any such theory of private judgment. Every denomination has, and must have, its own tradition, its form of doctrine, (whether written or unwritten, is of no account,) its general mind, its historical life be it never so lean and poor, into which the thinking of its individual members is educated or trained from the beginning, and through the medium of which only it is possible for them to exercise this boasted right of interpreting the Bible for themselves, so long as they remain faithful to its communion. This we hold to be for all thinking men the next thing to a self-evident truism. Even Dr. Berg himself, like every other Puritan, has his tradition. What orthodoxy he has, we are very sure, is not of his own discovery or concoction. It has come down to him from that very Mother, the old Catholic Church, which like another Nero he now seeks to destroy. For his *original* determinations in theology, his purely private and independent shapings of the unworked material of the Bible, with all due humility and respect be it spoken, we would not give a farthing or a fig.

How often is it necessary to ding into the deaf ears of Puritanism, that the question here relates not to the proper authority of the Bible, "the great principle of its absolute supremacy," but to the right interpretation of the Bible? "The natural man," says St. Paul, "receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Yet he has reason in his way, and the right of private judgment. Shall I go to him then, to know what the Scriptures teach? Can rationalism, or heresy, or schism, themselves born of such free judgment, be safely followed for any such purpose? Has every sect here the same right; and is one just of as much weight as another? Is it the doctrine of the Scriptures themselves, that no terms and conditions of a living kind, back of the consultation of this inspired rule, are necessary for its proper use; that Winebrennians, Campbellite Baptists, Universalists, and Unitarians, are on one and the same footing of privilege and power for this purpose with the true communion of God's saints? Most emphatically we say, No. Dr. Berg slanders the Bible, when he virtually affirms the contrary. It offers itself in no such latitudinarian style, to take the measure of its sense from any and every theological standpoint alike. It assumes every where the presence of an objective life answerable to its own nature, in the bosom of which alone its revelations can be rightly received and understood. The obedience of faith, the habit of an actual submission to religion as a concrete supernatural fact, must go before the use of private judgment here, and condition it continually, to make it worth a rush. Without that, it is the private judgment of mere blind nature, which is no better at last than miserable rationalism or infidelity. But now this obedience of faith, this sense of the mystery of godliness as a concrete living fact, is only another name for the communion of saints, and sympathy with the mind of the Holy Catholic Church. One must be in the Spirit, to receive or understand the things of the Spirit. But how can he be in the Spirit, if he be not in fellowship with the Church; if he own no supernatural mystery of godliness in the past history of the Church; if he know not what it is to be ruled or bound at all, in his theological life, by the authority of the Church, thus owned as an object of faith? He may still prate of the Spirit indeed, like the Anabaptists or Quakers or Muggletonians; but if his Spirit be not that of the Church, what title can it have to attention or respect? We pretend not now to settle, when and how precisely this ecclesiastical tradition must be allowed to rule the interpretation of the

Bible. Much less do we set it against all use of private judgment. All we say is, that the worth and safety of private judgment depend on the standpoint from which it is exercised; that all standpoints are not alike; and that, in the nature of the case, the only right standpoint is that of union with the life and harmony with the spirit, of the mystical body of Christ, as this has existed in the world, in a real and not simply imaginary way, from the beginning. This is not to exact a slavish submission to the Church, as distinguished from the Bible. It is only to refuse a slavish submission to some other system, Puritanism say or Unitarianism, setting itself up as a better expounder than the Church of the true and proper sense of the Bible. Where the issue is between the mind of the Church, as in the articles for instance of the ancient creed, and any such other mind pretending to read the Bible in a wholly different way, there can be no comparison between the claims of the two respectively to confidence and trust; and only to have any doubt about it indeed is to be on the confines of infidelity.

II. The next accusation of Dr. Berg relates to the doctrine of justification by faith; which we in particular are said to have denied, in our work entitled the *Mystical Presence*, by making the relation of Christ to his people to be such, that his righteousness is not merely set to their credit or account, by a fiction of law, in an outward forensic way, but is to be regarded as immanent in their very nature itself. This he will have to mean, that the believer is justified only by his own inherent or personal holiness, resulting from his union with Christ. Long ago we took some pains to show, that no such construction of our language was right. But it has not suited Dr. Berg to bear any thing of that sort in mind: and so here we have the old charge publicly paraded before the world again, without any sort of qualification or reserve, just as though the ninth commandment had been stricken from the decalogue, or were of no force at all for a true Albigensian "witness," sweating and staggering under the weight of so big a cause. Justification, we know, is not sanctification. But still the first must be the real ground or foundation of the second; and this requires that it should be something more than an outward act, that comes to no union whatever with the life of the sinner. It imputes to him the righteousness of Christ, by setting him in connection with the power of it as a new and higher order of life, grace in distinction from nature, wrought out in the bosom of humanity by Christ as the second Adam. This implies that what is so imputed or made over to men is not something out of them and

beyond them altogether, but, a fact already established in their nature itself, although a Divine act is needed to bring them thus into real communication with it as individuals." In such view, the righteousness of Christ, the power of his atonement, the glorious fact of redemption, may be regarded and spoken of as *immanent* now in our nature, just as the law of sin and death is immanent in it also under its merely Adamic view, making room for corresponding developments of individual life. Natural birth sets us in connection with human nature, as fallen in Adam and under the curse; regenerating grace sets us in connection with the same nature, as recovered from the curse, and so made capable of righteousness, through union with Christ. The actual individual life in either case, with such inherent properties as it may be found to possess, is conditioned by the presence of a real possibility going before it in the general life out of which it springs. This real possibility, the potential underlying the actual, is the one man's disobedience in the first case whereby many are made sinners, and in the second case the obedience of one by which many are made righteous, both immanent in humanity for their own momentous ends.

III. Next we have another breach of the ninth commandment, nay the breach of it three times over, in what the author of this solemn act and testimony declares to be the doctrine of the "Mystical Presence" on the constitution of Christ's Person.

We are charged first with teaching Eutychianism; though we have always protested against every thing of the sort, and have taken all pains to follow the tradition of the old church faith, avoiding here both the Scylla and the Charybdis between which it takes its awfully mysterious course. What Dr. Berg dislikes however is just this care to avoid *both* extremes. It must be with him either rock or whirlpool. His theology, though he may not know it, or at least not wish to see it, is in truth Nestorian. He objects to the old ecclesiastical term *theanthropic*, as applied to the Saviour's person. A still surer test is offered in the title *Deipara* or "Mother of God," as applied to the Blessed Virgin Mary. The system of thought in which Dr. Berg moves, makes no room for any such title. He would object to the use of it no doubt as at once popish and profane. And yet for the ancient church it was the very touchstone of orthodoxy over against Nestorianism, just as much as the term *consubstantial* was so also, when applied to the doctrine of the Saviour's true and proper divinity, over against the heresy of Arius. No man whose tongue falters in

pronouncing Mary *Mother of God*, can be orthodox at heart on the article of Christ's Person.<sup>1</sup>

Secondly we are charged with teaching, "that sin was in the person of the Mediator, and that the presence of sin in his person entailed the necessity of his suffering;" because of our saying, that the human nature which he assumed was that of Adam after the fall, and so a "*fallen* humanity," which was to be raised through this very mystery of the incarnation itself to a new and higher order of life. To this most abominable misrepresentation we reply in merciful Latin: "*Mentiris impudentissime.*" We abhor every such thought. It is not in our book. We have always disowned it. Paul says of the Saviour, that he was "made of a woman, made under the law;" and in another place we are told, that "he took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham." So in the Heidelberg Catechism it is said, "that he took upon him the very nature of man, of the flesh and blood of the Virgin Mary;" and this again, "because the justice of God requires that the same human nature which hath sinned should likewise make satisfaction for sin." This, and no more than this, is what we also have said; most explicitly and distinctly representing the assumption to have been at the same time in a form, which excluded the element of sin, and was therefore, we may say, an actual redemption of the nature it assumed, the raising of it into a higher order of life in Christ's person, from the beginning. Such has been our view plainly expressed. Dr. Berg knew what it was; or at least knew very well, that we abhorred the thought of making Christ a sinner; for he has been told so directly more than once. And yet here he comes, notwithstanding all this, with a miserable *consequence*, or inference merely of his own arbitrary drawing, to fasten upon us this very abomination; which he is not ashamed then solemnly to promulgate as a proof of heresy in the whole German Reformed Church.

Lastly we are charged, under this head of the Saviour's Person, with teaching the ubiquity of his glorified body. We have only to say here that the charge is false. The *Mystical*

---

<sup>1</sup> "Protestants respect her memory, as one whom the Lord peculiarly honored; all generations call her blessed, because she was the mother of the man Christ Jesus. But we hold it impious to style her the Mother of God, because her maternal relation to Jesus Christ extended no farther than his human nature." *Berg's Lectures on Romanism*, 1840, p. 143. Nestorius himself never taught, and the Council of Ephesus never condemned, more rank Nestorianism than that.

*Presence*, in particular, teaches nothing of this sort. On the contrary it affirms, p. 173, that "the relation of Christ to the Church involves no ubiquity or idealistic dissipation of his body, and requires no fusion of his proper personality with the persons of his people."

IV. Another head of accusation is found in the importance we attach to the holy sacraments. We are charged, in the usual stale fashion of the spiritualistic school, with putting the sacraments in the place of Him who appointed them; because we have claimed for them a character worthy of such appointment, making them to be, not dead signs merely, but real seals and vehicles of his adorable grace. "Inherent power to confer grace dwells alone in the blood and Spirit of Christ," we are gravely informed by this most courageous "testis veritatis;" as though he were enunciating a proposition at war with the whole idea of sacramental grace, and stood ready to maintain it at the risk of fire and faggot. This is as if one should say: God is the only source of power in the natural world, and *therefore* it is irreligious and absurd to ascribe activity to the lightning or force to the whirlwind. We have here again gross misrepresentation and slander. The doctrine which attributes grace to the sacraments is caricatured and falsified, to make it odious. It involves, we are told, the notion of an *opus operatum*, in the sense of a power in the sacraments working as from itself merely and in the way of blind magic. This however is a most perverse construction of the doctrine in question; for which too there is no excuse whatever; since the greatest pains have been taken to show, that it is held in no such ridiculous sense. The intrinsic power attributed to the sacraments, it has been said over and over again, is not to be viewed as something different from the grace of which Christ alone is the fountain and source; much less as something opposed to this only cause of our salvation; it is simply the action of this grace itself, exhibited to the faith of men under a divinely instituted form. He who works in nature by means of his own appointment, may surely be allowed to work instrumentally in the world of grace also, by such agencies as to himself seem best, without being supposed on this account to part with any portion of his own glory. This is what we mean by the intrinsic power of the holy sacraments. They belong to the kingdom of heaven, the new order of things superinduced upon the course of nature, by the birth, death, and resurrection, of the Word made Flesh; they are seals of what they represent in this kingdom; they carry in them, not simply the power of shadows in the sphere of nature,



but a truly supernatural force, answerable to the sphere of the Spirit which they serve to bring into real connection with our common human life. In this view they are mysteries, objects of faith, which it is absolutely profane to measure by any standard of mere sense. God has lodged in them a more than natural efficiency, for the accomplishment of heavenly ends; which however works not magically, but to take effect must be met with right dispositions on the part of men.

Dr. Berg, we say, caricatures this doctrine, to fight against it with better advantage and effect. But it must not be supposed, that he does not mean therefore to fight against it in its own proper form. The controversy here is no battle of words merely. The issue is at bottom a very real one, and we have no wish whatever to keep it out of sight. It involves the whole question of sacramental grace. Dr. Berg has no faith in such grace under any form, no faith in the sacraments at all, as the organs of a higher power than that of nature, for the accomplishment of supernatural ends. They are not to his mind *mysteries*. He sees no action of God in holy baptism, no participation of Christ's body and blood, by the wonder-working power of the Spirit, in the blessed eucharist. In all this however he only proclaims his own want of orthodoxy, while trying to make out a charge of error against others. To deny the mystical force of the sacraments, is to deny at the same time the supernatural character of the church, and in the end to subvert, as we verily believe, the whole mystery of the incarnation. The man who does so, may still continue to bluster and talk big about his zeal for the faith once delivered to the saints, abusing all who refuse to fall in with his confident mind. He may cry out: "The Bible, the Bible, the Bible of the Lord are *We*;" as though the private judgment of himself, and such as he, were one and the same thing with the sacred text itself, and no other judgment could possibly deserve the least consideration or regard. He may carry his appeal boldly to the tribunal of the *world's* common sense and natural reason, and stay himself on the verdict of a rationalistic generation of sects, with whom opinion has come to stand in the room of faith, making light of every thing like church authority in its proper form. But all this cannot help the actual falsehood of his position. He is a heretic notwithstanding; condemned by both Luther and Calvin; condemned by the Heidelberg Catechism and the Belgic Confession; condemned by the universal faith of the Church from the sixteenth century back to the fifth and from the fifth century again back to the second;

condemned by saints, martyrs, councils, and fathers; condemned, we will add, by the plain letter of the New Testament, as it has been understood by the Church through all ages. We are not disposed to be chary or tender here in the use of terms. We are put out of all patience rather with those, who pretend to respect the authority of the ancient creed, and yet make small account seemingly of an issue which concerns so immediately its truth and credit. For let it be observed, the question now in view regards not the mode of the sacramental mystery; whether for instance, in the case of the Lord's supper, it be by transubstantiation, or by consubstantiation, or by the mirifical incomprehensible operation of the Holy Ghost in the sense of Calvin and Ursinus; it regards the entire *fact* of the mystery itself. This, we say, entered into the universal faith of the ancient church. And it was not there as an outward accident merely. It was held to be of vital account. It formed the soul of doctrine, and the nucleus of all worship. To disown it then, is to disown the ancient church, and practically to renounce fellowship with the Christianity of all ages before the Reformation, as well as with the proper Lutheran and true Reformed faith of that Protestant epoch itself. To hear Dr. Berg, or any body else, glorying in such a theological predicament, as though it were the perfection of orthodoxy, is much of one sort with the spectacle of some unhappy patient in Bedlam, who sits in chains or rags and yet fancies himself a king.

V. The last offence with which we are charged in this valedictory demonstration, is our refusal to fall in with the anti-pope-ry hue and cry against the Romani Catholic Church. This evidently is a main point in the general bill of wrongs. It forms the culmination of the universal mischief, the "unkindest cut of all" in the whole list of our provocations. Much else might have been patiently borne. Here patience itself is put fairly out of breath.

Dr. Berg, it is well known, has a mortal antipathy to Romanism. He has long been distinguished as one of the school, which makes a vast merit of hating and cursing the Pope as Anti-christ, and builds its first and greatest pretension to what it calls evangelical piety, on its want of all charity towards Papists wherever found. He has staked his personal credit, his popularity as a minister, his reputation as a theologian, on the anti-pope-ry cause asserted and maintained in this radical style; and the consequence has been, as usual, that the cause in such form has grown to be for him a sort of "fixed idea," synonymous in some sense with the identity of his personal life. He has preach-

ed on it; made speeches on it; written a book on it, with a glorifying introduction from Dr. Brownlee. "I shall never apologize," he writes years ago, "either to the people of my own charge, or to the public, for preaching and writing against Popery; for I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; neither am I afraid to lift up my voice and to cry aloud against the abominations of the Man of Sin; and to rebuke, so far as my influence extends, the impudence of Antichrist.—For the system of Popery, the 'mystery of iniquity,' 'in all its deceivableness of unrighteousness,' and in all the shades and grades of its known and unknown abominations, I do entertain the most hearty abhorrence. I believe it to be the Arch-deceiver of precious souls, and the Master-piece of Satan." (*Lectures on Romanism*, p. 23, 24). Any quantity of similar stuff is to be found in other parts of the same book, as well as in the scurrilous pages of the Protestant Quarterly. In full keeping with this he cries aloud in his late act and testimony: "The Lord is my banner! Rome is the Amalek with which God never will make peace. He will have war with her from generation to generation! Rome is that wicked one whom the Lord will destroy, with the breath of his mouth, and the brightness of his coming. Rome is not to be reformed. She is wedded to her sins; and like the great millstone cast by the mighty angel into the depths of the sea, so shall she be cast down, to be found no more at all forever. They who partake of her sins, shall receive of her plagues. Let them look to it" (p. 21). In all this it is easy to read the symptoms of a very virulent affection. For one who surrenders himself to it, the anti-popery spirit is in truth a disease of the very worst kind. We know of no mental habit, short of absolute insanity, that seems to be more unfavorable to calm self-possession, to the exercise of clear sober judgment, or to the grace of godly sincerity and truth in the inward parts. Where it has come to be fully established, there is an end both of charity and reason, so far as the Church of Rome is concerned. The mind loses its hold on proper realities, and falls as it were under a sort of magical spell or ban which makes it impossible to see anything in its true color and right shape. It moves in a world of perversions, distortions, exaggerations, contradictions and lies, from which however, while the *fixed idea* lasts, no friendly light has any power to set it free. We have an exemplification of this in Dr. Berg. In his battles with Romanism, he spoils his own cause continually by extravagance and excess. He persecutes and spits venom, while affecting to play the bully for toleration and peace. He calls names, and spouts intemper-

ate blackguardisms, while pleasing himself with the idea that he is the pink of evangelical courtesy and good manners. He is himself irreverent and profane in the treatment of sacred things, while heaping accusations of profanity on Rome. He sets up himself, as the personification of private judgment, in order to pull down the Pope; holding with great show of zeal, that all men have the right of thinking as they choose, provided only they think with *him* and not some other way. He is great for free inquiry and light, and yet takes good care never to meet any question at issue in a really honorable and manly style; while all sorts of declamation, sophistry, and falsehood, are resorted to for the purpose of maintaining a show and sham of argument, where all argument in its true form is wanting.

Such is the general style and fashion of this intolerant anti-popery school. No one who has not been led to examine the matter seriously for himself, with some true *Protestant* courage such as is not to be put out of countenance by the mere barkings of fanaticism, can have any idea of the extent to which falsehood and misrepresentation are carried in the common popular warfare upon the Church of Rome. No church, as the great Dr. Johnson used to say, has been more monstrously slandered. Our religious papers, it is to be feared, lie here too generally under dreadful guilt. They are so reckless in their assertions; so ready to catch up every idle story and dirty anecdote, that seems to tell against the Catholic Church; so slow for the most part in correcting their own falsehoods, when they have been fairly exposed; so unwilling to allow good motives and so quick to suspect bad ones, as though Paul's account of charity here had all become reversed, and its province were to rejoice in iniquity and not in the truth. Nor is this the worst of the case. The warfare in question is conducted too generally without any regard to principles. It is forgotten that great interests of religion, deep and solemnly momentous truths, in the very nature of the case, are involved in Romanism; and the whole object then is to overthrow and destroy merely, regardless of all consequences that may go along with the wreck. Anti-popery in such form is purely negative. It seeks only to break down; and every blow is welcome that looks this way, though it be never so rude and blind. Even Kossuth and Mazzini, not to speak of Ronge, are hailed as welcome helpers in what is felt to be thus a common cause; and Red Republicanism grows respectable, as it is heard blaspheming the Pope. That merit is allowed to cover almost any quantity of sins besides. Conducted in such temper, the war runs every where

into ecclesiastical monstrosities and contradictions, overturning in a wholesale way in one direction the very interests which it pretends to uphold in another.

When we are taxed with refusing to succumb to the dictation of this fanatical and tyrannical school, we very readily admit the truth of the charge. We do not hold the Papacy, as such, to be Antichrist. There have been, we doubt not at all, many godly and pious Popes. We do not believe, that the Catholic Church was the synagogue of Satan, for more than a thousand years before the rise of Luther, and that the only true succession of Christianity lay all that time among miserable sects on the outside of it. We are not willing to bastardize Protestantism itself, by making the Roman baptism from which it springs to be but a baptism of the Devil, unchurching thus at the same time with a single stroke the whole Christianity of the middle ages, and of the ages before away back to the days of Cyprian and Tertullian. We do not feel bound at all, to follow implicitly the sense which Dr. Berg is pleased to put into two or three Bible texts, *against* the authority of Grotius, Hammond, Hengstenberg and Stuart, and we know not how many great Protestant critics besides. It is no part of our religion to hate and curse Catholics, to lampoon their priesthood, to make a mock of their worship, to treat their holy things with scorn and contempt. We have read too much church history, and looked too widely into the present state of the world, for that. This moderation may be very unpalatable to Dr. Berg, and the school to which he belongs. But we cannot help it. Such is the state of our mind. We are not now asserting it however as necessarily right. That is not really the point at issue. The question is only, whether it be an offence against Protestant orthodoxy to think in this way. That is what Dr. Berg maintains. It is not with him a matter of freedom, to differ here from the rule to which he is himself so unhappily sworn. He lays it down as a foundation *principle*, that Rome is Antichrist, Babylon, and Amalek, that the Pope is officially the Man of Sin, that Mede's key to the prophecies is infallibly true, that Popery has been from first to last "the master-piece of Satan," (casting out devils, it would seem, through Beelzebub, the prince of the devils.) This, we are told, is the only theory by which Protestantism can stand. It must pass for a term of orthodoxy, an article of faith. Since when, however, we ask in reply, has any such narrow and inquisitorial rule been in force? By what ecclesiastical Star Chamber was it established? In what Draconian code is it now to be found? When, where, and how, especially,

has the German Reformed Church erected any test of this sort, to bind the conscience of her ministers, either in Europe or in this country? The test is arbitrary altogether, an imposition smuggled in privily to subvert "the liberty which we have in Christ Jesus," and to "bring us into bondage." We disown it; we give no place to it by subjection, not even for an hour; that the truth of the gospel may remain without damage and harm. We deny the right of any man, or any set and party of men, to frame rules and constitutions for us in this high-handed autocratic and overbearing style. Those who choose to make a large part of their religion consist in abusing and slandering Romanism, are at liberty of course for themselves to indulge as far as they please their own malevolent taste; and there is nothing to hinder them either from doing what they can, by rant and slang, to make others of the same mind. But let them stick to such moral suasion. When they mount the tripod, and claim to be oracles, and affect to launch thunderbolts, making their miserable hobbies articles of faith, and then denouncing as heretics all who refuse to take up the same song, it is high time to let them know that they are driving things quite too fast and too far. Whatever may come of them hereafter, their hobbies are *not yet* fully installed, for universal Protestantism, oracles and articles of faith.

So much for the burden of Dr. Berg's Farewell Words, as directed immediately against ourselves. We are now ready for the consideration of it, as a cry against the German Reformed Church. That of course is the main end of the whole proclamation. It is intended to be an apology, as we have seen, for an act of revolutionary secession. Dr. Berg wishes to play martyr. He claims to be a seceder for conscience' sake. This involves necessarily the idea of an issue with the whole body, which he is led thus heroically to forsake. To make out his case, it is not enough to muster charges, like those we have just been considering, against one man or another singly taken; that would be a poor reason for so big a step; it must be contrived in some way to give the matter a far more general character, and to bring in the whole church as *particeps criminis*, party to the alleged offence. Only in that form do we get at last a *nodus vindice dignus*, full opportunity and fit occasion for such a Samson Agonistes to put forth all his strength.

"I may declare," says the late Race Street Pastor, "that I have made the sacrifice, which I offer this evening, for the sake of principle." Again, (p. 7): "These familiar faces, this pulpit, this Bible, the tones of that noble organ, the scrge of

Zion, and all that is identified with them during the scenes of my ministry, are written indelibly upon my heart; time cannot efface them; and yet, I declare before you all, none of these things move me, in comparison with the principles which demand that I should sacrifice them all. Upon that altar, inscribed Jehovah-Nissi, I would lay them; and to that blessed Lord who gave them, I here surrender all I have and all I am, for the maintenance of these principles, until He demands the record of my stewardship. Jehovah is my banner!" This is the language of a man, brought into great and sore straits for what he takes to be the truth. It puts one in mind of Huss, Luther, Hugh Latimer, or John Knox. The meaning is, without stils: "You see in me, good people, a great and glorious confessor and martyr; who to save his faith, is forced to tear himself away from a fond and pleasant settlement, and go on hard pilgrimage to Gibraltar. The German Reformed Church has persecuted me into this cruel *sacrifice*, by exacting from me terms of communion to which as an honest man I have found it impossible to submit. I am a victim for righteousness' sake!" Such is the general charge; which is then made however still more direct and precise. "It would be a task utterly beyond my strength and your patience," the libel runs, (p. 9.), "to sketch the details of the developments of the last seven years of the history of the German Reformed Church. You know, that I protested against them in their incipency. And I remember with gratitude the cordiality with which this congregation sustained me, when I stood in the painful position of recording my vote in solitary opposition, without a single voting ministerial associate to keep me in countenance, against the overwhelming odds by which the new doctrines were sustained." And so again, more solemnly still (p. 22.): "The Church of the German Reformation I do love in my inmost soul. If I had not loved the Church, I would have held my peace, and not sacrificed my comfort for the sake of doctrinal differences. I say it not boastfully, but still I will say it, if there is a minister in the German Reformed Church who has done more, or suffered more, during the last seven years, for the sake of these principles, I do not know him. Brethren, I know the ordeal through which I must pass, both among friends and foes. I feel that my position is painful, but I am sure in my own mind that it is right. I cannot co-operate with the Synod of the German Reformed Church. Its late action is a practical avowal of sympathy with views which I cannot endure, and subsequent developments have satisfied me that my mission in its communion is fulfilled."



All this is designed to be in a sort of modest parallelism with the relation of Elijah to Israel, in the days of Ahab and Queen Jezebel. The German Reformed Church answers to the Ten Tribes, gone or fast going after Baal. Dr Berg is the solitary Tishbite under the juniper tree.

But what now has the Church been doing, to drive this new prophet from her bosom? Has she undertaken to change the Heidelberg Catechism? Has she pretended to bring in new articles of faith? Has she trampled in any direction on the rights of conscience? Has she required Dr. Berg to give up any opinion, or to accept any opinion, contrary to his own sense of truth and duty? Has he been subjected to impositions or restraints in any way, in the exercise of his ministry? What *principles* has he been called upon to sacrifice. What disabilities, what penalties and pains, has he found himself compelled to brave, in carrying out his mission in his own way? Those who plead for the sacred right of secession, in such a case, take the ground commonly that there must be a real compulsion of some sort to make it right. Mere corruption in a church is not of itself enough to justify such revolutionary violence. There must be palpable opposition to the truth, virtually *forcing* its witnesses to withdraw. Has there been any such cause for secession in the present case?

Nothing of the sort is pretended. The German Reformed Church never made more account of her Catechism, than she does at this time. She has passed no act, which by any construction can be resolved into an imposition of new articles of belief; no act that can be said so much as to sanction in form the particular points even on which this complaint of Dr. Berg is made to hinge. Right or wrong, they have never been enforced by any ecclesiastical legislation. What hurts the tender conscience of Dr. Berg, is not that he has been required to yield here to the mind of others, but that others have not been forced to yield to *his* mind. He leaves the Church, not for what it has done, but for what it has refused to do, in the way of intolerance and persecution. It is a sacrifice for bad humor's sake, more than for the sake of a good conscience.

It is now a number of years since Dr. Berg first put himself forward publicly, in opposition to the Mercersburg Professors. The occasion was the publication of Dr. Schaff's tract, entitled the *Principle of Protestantism*. The character of this able production is now well known. It seeks to place the cause of the Reformation on solid and sure ground, by defending it from the charge of revolutionary radicalism, and asserting its

right to be considered a legitimate result of the previous history of the Church. This involves of course the acknowledgment of a true historical succession of Christianity, in the bosom of the Papacy during the middle ages; a thought directly at war with the fond conceit of those, who make Popery *per se* the "Master-piece of the Devil." It was resolved accordingly to crush Mercersburg. By a wise regulation in the constitution of the Seminary, it is provided that charges against a Theological Professor must be brought first before the Board of Visitors, by a responsible accuser and in a precise form, with notice and copy duly furnished, sometime beforehand, to the party accused; and only after there is found to be cause for them by the Board of Visitors, can they come regularly before the Synod. Such equity however suited not the prosecution, of which we now speak. Its policy was to rouse popular odium, and overwhelm its victim without a regular trial. With the help of the Helffenstein family, Dr. Berg got a vote of the small Classis of Philadelphia, calling upon the Synod to try, not Dr. Schaff, but his book, for the purpose of seeing whether it did not teach certain vague specifications of false doctrine. No process could well be more irregular. The Synod however at its meeting in York, most indulgently waived the question of order, and allowed the prosecution to go forward in this most irresponsible form. An examination *was* instituted. Dr. Berg was heard as prosecuting attorney, to his own heart's content. The end is well known. The Synod did not pretend to endorse the book; the case called for nothing of that sort; but it was solemnly declared, that no cause was found in it for the accusations of the Philadelphia Classis, or of the clique rather which then acted in its name. The decision was the next thing to unanimous. The only ministerial vote recorded against it, his own mouth being witness, was that of Dr. Berg himself, who as grand inquisitor and prosecuting plaintiff had in truth no business to vote at all.

This took place in 1845. Since that time, Dr. Berg, encouraged and supported by the Helffenstein family, has repeatedly tried to bring one or other of the professors, or both of them together, to some sort of trial before the Synod; first at Carlisle in 1846; then at Lancaster in 1847; then at Martinsburg in 1850; and then again at Lancaster in 1851. In no case, however, has he condescended to take the proper constitutional course for reaching his end; not even after this was pointed out to him in the plainest terms, as indispensably necessary to the allowance of any further prosecution. The Synod, he was told, had yielded this point once, (unwisely perhaps,) but would not

do it again. But the constitutional rule was not to his taste. It had its difficulties. It involved too much responsibility. His plan was rather to agitate, to deal in loose charges and popular declamation before the world, to get up a pressure on the outside of the church, to create a faction within, to make capital for this out of every new trouble that might arise, no matter from what quarter, and so to carry his object finally by violent assault. For years, he has kept up this dishonorable course, doing as much as in him lay to break down the credit of the institutions at Mercersburg, and to embarrass the professors in their work. Year after year, pains have been taken to have it noised abroad that they were to be brought to account, on charges which there was no resolution to put into distinct shape, or to urge in a lawful and manly way; and then when these rumours came to nothing, the Synod was blamed for not allowing the investigation to go forward. We doubt if there ever was a more flagrant system of schismatical agitation, so patiently borne with for the like length of time by any ecclesiastical body. When we consider the comparatively small strength of the church, and the unfavorable influences which have been constantly at work in the spirit of surrounding denominations, the only wonder is that this guerilla warfare has not long since proved triumphantly successful by bringing all the operations of the church to a dead stand. And yet it is of his untiring zeal in such bad form for such iniquitous end, that Dr. Berg is only too modest now *not to boast*, as an argument of his doing and suffering more for the German Reformed Church, during the last seven years, than any other minister in her communion! If he could have blown up her institutions altogether, and demolished half her altars by dissension and schism, the martyr-prophet might have considered his glory complete. No wonder that such a man should wish to blot the very idea of schism, "that word which has so often been the catchword of spiritual despotism," from the ecclesiastical vocabulary.

At the last meeting of the Synod in Lancaster, the old game was renewed again, under what were deemed to be the most favorable auspices, and with the most buoyant hopes of success. Six months before, the senior professor in the Seminary had tendered his resignation to the Board of Visitors, a measure towards which he had been openly moving for a whole year before. Afterwards, when the first article on Early Christianity appeared and created some talk, it was industriously reported on the outside, that the resignation was on account of reigning dissatisfaction in the church. Had there been any ground for prosecution,

the way was still open for Dr. Berg, and his staff, to undertake it in regular and right method, by tabling distinct charges before the Board of Visitors, and so bringing the case in the end, under due responsibility, into open Synod. Nothing of this sort however was done. The plan was rather, as on other occasions, to make a noise, get up an excitement, and then come down on the case with a sort of mob judgment, when the Synod was in session. On the question of receiving our resignation, it was proposed to intervene suddenly by some act that might amount to a general censure, without the formality of a trial. The Rev. Jacob Helffenstein, in particular, showed a very fierce, nay, even rabid, desire to go into a declamatory assault and battery on the spot, as though the party to be crushed had been already arraigned in fact, convicted and condemned. Every one can see, that it would have been the height of injustice, to have yielded to such irregular prosecution in any way. With great dignity accordingly, the Synod refused to allow any such declamatory assault and battery in its presence; and just because such an unrighteous effort had been made to load the resignation with an *ex post facto* sense, which did not belong to it in its own proper form, it was resolved farther almost unanimously not to accept it at the time, but to throw it entirely on the will of the professor to take such course in regard to it afterwards as to himself might seem best. Such generous and noble regard for justice, however, proved sorely displeasing to the unrighteous persecution whose purposes it served to disappoint and defeat. Mr. Helffenstein at once appealed to the unchurchly and antipopery spirit of other sects, boldly and *falsely* declaring that the G. R. Synod had made itself responsible for all our published views; and that these views included all the "gorgons, hydras, and chimeras dire," which he himself saw fit to hallucinate into them, in his twofold capacity of judge and jury. The representation, we say very deliberately, was *false*, though cordially echoed by many of our evangelical papers throughout the land. No such points, as it alleged, were ever brought before the Synod. There was no trial; no arraignment; nobody to acquit or condemn; no vote that looked towards the determination of any theological question; no question of that sort at all under consideration. Dr. Berg himself, at the time, knew very well that the action of the Synod was not to be taken in this way. When Mr. Helffenstein rose in a pet, and made a pitiful threat of secession, the Race Street pastor promptly disclaimed every thought of this sort. He was resolved, as all along before, to remain in the church, of whose treatment he felt that he had

no cause to complain. So in the next number of the Protestant Quarterly, he very distinctly defended the Synod from the false sense put upon its action by his intemperate companion in arms, and expressed his full determination to be if possible the leader of a revolutionary party in its bosom. But now, all at once, the aspect of things is changed. The Helfensteins continue dutifully in their place; while Dr. Berg takes up the very lie he formerly disowned, makes the action of the last Synod to have been at once judicial and legislative, charges it accordingly before high heaven with wholesale heresy, and affects to leave it with violent secession as a martyr, fairly driven from its bosom for conscience' sake.

To cover this huge inconsistency, it is insinuated that new occasion has been given since the meeting of Synod for the act now perpetrated. "Subsequent developments have satisfied me," he says, "that my mission in its communion is fulfilled." What are these developments? We are not told. One main cause of offence might seem to be gone. The professorship which *we* once filled is vacant. Our resignation was carried into full effect, as originally proposed, before the tocsin of the Protestant Quarterly was sounded for a combination to oust us by main force. We know of no other developments, except the completion of our articles on Early Christianity, and the fact that his tocsin cry for a revolutionary convention found notwithstanding no favor, but was met rather on all sides, as it deserved to be, with silent indignation and contempt. Are these the ominous events, that have satisfied Dr. Berg at last that the G. R. Church "is no longer his home?" So really it would seem.

We see here the true nature of this whole issue. The other points of accusation, in our case, are merely by the way. The grand cause of offence is, that we are not willing to hate and curse Romanism in the usual anti-popery style, and that we dare to call in question the enormous falsehoods, both exegetical and historical, on which this system of outrageous hatred is built. Our articles on Early Christianity are charged with being an assault on Protestantism, which the Church was bound to rebuke. They in reality show only that Early Christianity back to the middle of the second century was something materially different from modern Protestantism, and closely related to the Catholicism of later times; a *fact*, which Dr. Berg himself has not pretended latterly to deny, and on which we hope to shed additional light hereafter in our articles on Cyprian. But this fact in the end makes it necessary to acknowledge a true historical succession of Christianity in the Roman Church, for the

rational vindication of Protestantism itself. Dr. Berg, as we have seen, stands violently committed to the unhistorical hypothesis, by which the Papacy *per se* is held to be Antichrist, and the church of the middle ages the synagogue of Satan; and like this school in general, he has no power to tolerate any view different from his own. We have openly resisted the authority of every such hypothesis as an article of faith, and have chosen to construe history in some harmony with our Saviour's promise, that the gates of hell should never prevail against his church. In our articles on Early Christianity, we have taken pains to say very distinctly, that we do not own the anti-popery scheme to which Dr. Berg is sworn, as any part whatever of the proper orthodoxy of the German Reformed Church. This declaration of independence formed in his eyes the climax of offence. His whole position required, that the Church should visit it with indignant rebuke. The Church however has refused to acknowledge or sustain his position, in any such proscriptive way. Ten years ago, when he tried to get a vote of Synod declaring Roman baptism invalid, his motion was laid under the table; but the course of things lately has amounted to a still more distinct and unmistakeable intimation, that the genius of the G. R. Church is in no harmony with radicalism of this sort, and that it is not likely soon to brook the servile yoke of any such foreign and miserably narrow tradition. This is a rebuke for Dr. Berg. He feels it severely. It has touched his pride, and so his conscience. For years he has been laboring to inoculate the G. R. Church with the virus of his own fanaticism; and now this is the end of it. His labor has come to nothing. He finds his zeal foiled, his ambition defeated. Othello's occupation is gone, his "*mission* is fulfilled." The Church "is no longer his home." He does accordingly the best he can; makes a merit of valorously forsaking its communion, and endeavours to carry away with him the laurels of a great and glorious martyr. *Requiescat in pace!*

J. W. N.